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#### Duckworth is going to beat Kirk – Trump bashing, best polls, electoral trends – this seat is key to the long-term senatorial agenda

Chicago Tribune 6/9/16 [Chicago Tribune Editorial Board; June 9, 2016; Moving past Trump and Blagojevich: Kirk, Duckworth and Illinois; http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/opinion/editorials/ct-edit-kirk-duckworth-blago-trump-edit-0610-md-20160609-story.html//TPB]

As a backdrop to one of the most heated U.S. Senate races in the country, U.S. Sen. Mark Kirk this week joined the ranks of prominent Republicans forced to dump Donald Trump.¶ Kirk's opponent in the Nov. 8 election, Democratic U.S. Rep. Tammy Duckworth, had criticized Kirk for failing to denounce Trump. Duckworth amped up her attack following the presumptive GOP presidential nominee's characterization of a judge of Mexican descent as incapable of impartially handling a Trump lawsuit.¶ Trump's remarks set off a collective groan — audible, even — among leading Republicans who already had assumed some political risk by endorsing him. U.S. House Speaker Paul Ryan called Trump's remarks a "textbook definition of racism." Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell called on Trump to apologize. Former presidential candidate Lindsey Graham said Trump's statement was "un-American."¶ Kirk, who during the primary season said he would support whichever GOP nominee emerged, officially backed away from that position Tuesday:¶ "I have spent my life building bridges and tearing down barriers — not building walls. That's why I find Donald Trump's belief that an American-born judge of Mexican descent is incapable of fairly presiding over his case is not only dead wrong, it is un-American," Kirk said in a statement. "After much consideration, I have concluded that Donald Trump has not demonstrated the temperament necessary to assume the greatest office in the world."¶ This surely won't be the last episode in which Duckworth pressures Kirk to repudiate Trump. But for those of us with long memories, this sort of exercise invites a boomerang effect.¶ Does Duckworth want to spend five months defending her 2006 re-election endorsement of Rod Blagojevich? Recall that at the time — well before his removal from office and convictions on felony charges — his administration reeked of scandals. The then-governor, now-prisoner was fending off federal subpoenas; federal agents had interviewed him about appointments to state boards and commissions; investigators were probing activities at several state agencies. Recall too that, days after winning re-election, Blagojevich appointed Duckworth to run the Illinois Department of Veterans Affairs.¶ Duckworth and Kirk can try to play gotcha with guilt-by-association, or each of them instead can dwell on why she or he should represent this very troubled state in the U.S. Senate.¶ For the candidate who chooses the former route, there lie dragons. Any frenzy dedicated to Trump denouncements, any monthslong focus on the Blagojevich years, will cheat Illinois voters of serious debate on bigger issues going forward: the enormous national debt, the chronic deficit spending, the always evolving terrorist threats, the military prowess of Russia and China, the warfare raging in the Middle East, the Illinois economy that hasn't recovered seven years (to the month) after the end of the Great Recession.¶ This Illinois contest is one of the most heated U.S. Senate races in the country. Republicans hold 54 seats currently to the Democrats' 46 — two of those are independent senators who caucus with the Democrats. Nationally, 34 seats are on the ballot in November.¶ The election website FiveThirtyEight gives Duckworth a 77 percent chance of taking Kirk's seat. The site identifies the Kirk seat as one of two nationally that are most likely to flip this year. Kirk won that seat in 2010 during a nonpresidential year when many voters, and especially many Democrats, tend to stay home. This year he faces a bigger challenge.¶ There is so much for these candidates to discuss with the people they wish to represent. Kirk and Duckworth differ on trade policy, on foreign policy (including the Iran nuclear deal), on immigration and the handling of Syrian refugees, on Guantanamo, on spending, on entitlement reform ...¶ Voters here who cast ballots in the race will not just be choosing between Kirk and Duckworth. They could be deciding which party controls the U.S. Senate and that chamber's agenda for the next decade.¶ Ms. Duckworth, Mr. Kirk, you can talk to all of us about those issues. Or you can trade insults about Trump and Blagojevich.¶ If one of you wants to pick at those scabs, though, beware the risk: You can make this fight for a U.S. Senate seat a much easier choice for Illinois voters.

#### Plan is massively unpopular – Voters PERCEIVE it as appeasement, weak on china, and ineffective – inevitably gets tied to ALL china related fears, regardless of specifics

Gross, 13 --- Donald, Donald Gross is a lawyer, business strategist and policy expert who also serves as an adjunct fellow of Pacific Forum CSIS, a non-profit research institute affiliated with the Center for Strategic and International Studies. A former State Department official, he developed and implemented U.S. policy on strategic trade, national security and foreign relations. Earlier, he was Director of Legislative Affairs at the National Security Council in the White House and Counselor of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, “The China Fallacy”, http://www.donaldgross.net/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/The-China-Fallacy-Excerpts.pdf

The difficulty of moving beyond current policy Despite the questionable premises underlying much of prevailing U.S. policy toward China, policymakers and commentators find it difficult to move beyond existing views. There are several reasons why this is so. To begin with, current policy is complex. It stresses preparation for a security threat from China at the same time as it promotes U.S. business interests there. It protects uncompetitive American companies from the adverse effects of China’s rapidly growing economy (unintentionally creating a nationalist backlash in Beijing) while largely ignoring China’s domestic political system. The seemingly contradictory elements of U.S. policy—in the face of real uncertainty about the direction of China’s military, economic and political development—mask the true dangers and weaknesses of the overall U.S. approach. A second reason why policymakers and commentators find it difficult to move beyond existing China policy is that groups with vested interests have a stake in its various components. These groups attempt to mold public opinion by defining “acceptable” and “mainstream” views of China, which provide strong support for the existing policy framework. This is especially true of security policy, where hawks who believe in a coming military clash with China also argue that the U.S. should pursue a military buildup to prepare for it. Not surprisingly, the military services and defense contractors in the United States are important members of the political constituency that favors an aggressive security strategy toward China. The specter of a large and amorphous “China threat” has proved useful as a replacement for the “Soviet threat” to spur the Pentagon’s acquisition of advanced weapons systems, especially at a time of overall defense budget cuts. Another group with a vested interest in a hard line security policy is the traditional “China lobby” (originally strong supporters of the anticommunist regime that led Taiwan after the Chinese revolution in 1949) which has concentrated in recent years on ensuring the U.S. supplies large quantities of high-quality weapons and military equipment to Taiwan to deter and defend against a possible Chinese attack. Perhaps the overriding reason why many policymakers and commentators cannot easily move beyond existing views of China is that they do not sufficiently factor into their analysis the major security, political and economic benefits that the United States and its Asian allies could achieve through improved U.S.-China relations. Many commentators tend to emphasize worst-case scenarios and pessimistic assessments which are seen by the media as “sober-minded” and “realistic.” It seems fruitless to these analysts to describe future benefits from a state of affairs that they believe will likely never come to pass. Influenced by the “tyranny of the status quo,” policymakers and commentators often feel the best they can do is to propose incremental changes that could achieve small policy improvements over time. U.S. politicians who attack Beijing for economic practices that lead to “shipping American jobs to China” also discourage policymakers and experts from highlighting the benefits of improved relations between the two countries. When these politicians exploit patriotic feelings and engage in demagogic “China bashing” to attract votes, they have a chilling effect on policy analysts. In this atmosphere, proposals that could significantly improve relations become vulnerable to political attacks as “appeasement,” “un-American” or “weak on China.” Conversely, highly questionable protectionist measures to help uncompetitive companies are seen as “tough” and “pro-American.” The upshot is that the acceptable bounds of the policy debate on China are far narrower than they ought or need to be.

#### Best models prove the link – Senate elections are determined on three variables – that perfectly line up for Obama’s approval rating to be the key issue in the Illinois race

Real Clear Politics 16 [Sean Trende; Senior Elections Analyst for RealClearPolitics, practiced law for eight years at Kirkland & Ellis LLP, and Hunton & Williams LLP, juris doctorate from Duke University, a master's degree in political science from Duke University and bachelor's degree from Yale University; January 11, 2016; Calculating Democrats' Chances of Regaining the Senate; http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2016/01/11/calculating\_democrats\_chances\_of\_regaining\_the\_senate.html///TPB]

The developing conventional wisdom is that Democrats’ chances of taking back the Senate in 2016 hinge on their ability to claim a third term in the White House. But is this true? Like most conventional wisdom, there is some truth here, but it probably overstates the case.¶ To address this question, I decided to revisit a Senate election model I developed early in 2014. I won’t completely rehash the details of the model here (you can read them at the above links), but the basic theory is simple: Our federal elections have become so polarized that you can now predict Senate races accurately knowing just three variables: The president’s job approval rating, whether there is an incumbent in a race, and whether one party or the other nominates a badly damaged, controversial candidate (think Christine O’Donnell).¶ The data are collected from 2004, 2006, 2010 and 2012. I’ve updated the model to include data from 2014 as well. The 2008 results are not included because at a certain point, presidential job approval stops mattering; a president with a 25 percent job approval (which George W. Bush had in late 2008) does little more harm than a president with a 35 percent job approval, because that difference largely occurs with partisan Republicans who are likely to vote for a Republican regardless (more on this later). For the same reason, I do not go back to 1998-2002. In years where the job approval question did not appear at the state level in the exit polls, job approval is estimated from the national job approval in the exit polling, modified by the state’s partisan voter index.¶ The model generally performs well. For starters, in early 2014, it indicated that if Barack Obama’s job approval on Election Day were 44 percent, then Republicans should gain nine seats. That is where the exit polls had his job approval, and Republicans gained nine seats. It predicted the Democrats’ vote shares pretty accurately as well, including coming within one point of the results in hard-to-predict races like North Carolina and Colorado (there were misses in excess of four points in South Dakota, where Larry Pressler depressed the Democratic vote, and in Oregon, where Monica Wehby’s campaign imploded). Across all years, the median error is one point, as is the mode.¶ When modeling, it can be useful to go back after the fact and check to see if your model did indeed predict things well. For example, if we run the model using only the data from 2006 and 2010-2014 to try and predict 2004, it suggest that Republicans should have picked up four seats that year, which they did. Utilizing this approach for other years in the sample results in a prediction of Democrats picking up six seats in 2006 (they indeed picked up six), losing five seats in 2010 (they lost six), and losing one seat in 2012 (they picked up two). Incidentally, it performs terribly in 2008, predicting Democratic gains of 13 seats. Republicans over-perform the predictions by about seven points on average. This seems to validate the assumption that 2008 is too dissimilar to include.¶ So what does this model predict for 2016? Well, we’re faced with two problems. First, we don’t know what President Obama’s job approval will be. There are a few ways to deal with this, but I ultimately utilized the same approach as I did in 2014: by generating random numbers following a normal distribution around various means (I’ll explain more on this below).¶ More importantly, we don’t know where problem candidates will surface, so I assigned probabilities. I gave Republicans a 10 percent chance of nominating a problem candidate in Nevada (where Sharron Angle is considering another bid), 30 percent in Florida, 10 percent in Illinois, 10 percent in New Hampshire, 10 percent in Alaska, 20 percent in Arizona, and 30 percent in Indiana. I also marked Wisconsin as a state with a problematic incumbent, given Ron Johnson’s steeper-than-usual learning curve. One could make a case for including Mark Kirk in Illinois as well, but I ultimately opted not to consider him problematic (mostly because I had made a judgment call in the opposite direction with Johnson).¶ I then ran the model with some different assumptions about where Obama’s job approval would likely be this fall. For example, let’s assume that the most likely outcome is that the president’s job approval will stay more or less around 45 percent, but acknowledge that it could be higher or lower. If we run 10,000 simulated races within these parameters, then the median outcome is no net change in the makeup of the Senate. Democrats win control of the Senate only about 5 percent of the time in this scenario.¶ On the other hand, if we see the president’s job approval increase to 50 percent (with allowances on either side) then the median likely outcome is a Democratic pickup of two seats, with Democrats winning the Senate 26 percent of the time.¶ If we see a substantial increase in the president’s job approval, to around 55 percent, Democrats win the Senate around 67 percent of the time, and pick up five seats. At 60 percent job approval, Democrats pick up eight seats, and control the Senate 94 percent of the time (this is different from what I found in 2014 because the model’s parameters have been re-estimated, there have been fewer Republican retirements than I anticipated, and problematic challengers, at least for now, haven’t really emerged).

#### Kirk is the huge push to put sanctions on Iran

IPS 15 [Institute for Policy Studies; last updated: July 20, 2015; Kirk, Mark; http://rightweb.irc-online.org/profile/kirk\_mark///TPB]

Kirk has been a leading proponent in the Senate of increasing pressure on Iran over its nuclear program, once arguing that “it’s okay to take the food out of the mouths” of Iranian citizens because of their government’s actions.[4]¶ In July 2015, after the successful negotiations between Iran and leading world powers (the P5+1) on a comprehensive nuclear deal, Kirk proclaimed that “tens of thousands of people in the Middle East are gonna lose their lives because of this decision by Barack Hussein Obama.” He wildly added that what President Obama really wanted was “to get nukes to Iran.”[5] In a July 2015 interview with a Boston-based radio station, Kirk characterized the nuclear deal as the “greatest appeasement since Chamberlain gave Czechoslovakia to Hitler.”[6]¶ In the lead up to a November 2014 negotiations deadline on the nuclear deal, Kirk and fellow Iran hawk Sen. Robert Menendez (D-NJ) argued that “a good deal will dismantle, not just stall, Iran’s illicit nuclear program.” Kirk and Menendez also threatened “to work” with their “colleagues in Congress to act decisively” if a deal emerges that does not meet their standards, including imposing “stringent limits” on Iran’s nuclear program that will last “for decades.”[7]¶ In 2015, after Menendez was indicted on federal corruption charges related to his relationship with a Florida businessman, Kirk suggested that Menendez was targeted by the Justice Department because of his views on Iran.[8]¶ In November 2013, shortly before Iran and the P5+1 reached an interim agreement that saw Iran cap its enrichment at low levels only allowing for the production of nuclear power and submit to intrusive inspections in exchange for partial sanctions relief, Kirk told reporters that he was working closely with the American Israel Public Affairs Committee to push new sanctions through the Senate. Kirk also launched unusually personal attacks against the Obama administration diplomats charged with shepherding the deal, deriding them as political appointees who "desperately want[ed] a New York Times article saying how great they are." Comparing himself to the famous Copernican scientist who was persecuted by the medieval Catholic Church for his beliefs, Kirk concluded, "Now I know exactly what Galileo felt like when he was dragged before the papal court."[9]¶ Kirk argued that more sanctions were necessary to get Iran to agree to a deal, even as talks were already underway between U.S. and Iranian negotiators—an approach that critics warned would have sunk any prospects for a deal.[10] Invoking a common neoconservative analogy likening the U.S. standoff with Iran to the run-up to World War II, Kirk at one point complained to reporters that "This administration, like Neville Chamberlain, is yielding a large and bloody conflict in the Middle East involving Iranian nuclear weapons that will now be part of our children’s future. And the best way to prevent that from happening is to continue sanctions."[11]¶ Kirk's remarks followed a supposedly confidential hearing in which Secretary of State John Kerry urged the Senate Banking Committee to let the negotiations proceed before considering new rounds of sanctions. Kirk claimed that Kerry had told him to dismiss an Israeli assertion that a proposed interim agreement between Iran and its international negotiating partners would only delay Iran's enrichment activities by 24 days. "The pitch was very unconvincing," Kirk said. "It was fairly anti-Israeli. I was supposed to disbelieve everything the Israelis had just told me, and I think the Israelis probably have a pretty good intelligence service.”[12]¶ "So," observed former CIA analyst Paul Pillar in response to Kirk's claim, "a United States senator was calling the U.S. secretary of state and the vice president liars because of what a foreign government had told him." Pillar called Kirk's advocacy for the Israeli government's position "the most extreme form of any member of Congress, to the point of being a caricature," and accused Kirk of "doing everything he can to overturn a diplomatic process designed to prevent both a war and an Iranian nuclear weapon."[13]¶ Kirk also directed a barb at Iranians. "How do you define an Iranian moderate?" he asked reporters. "It’s an Iranian who is out of bullets or out of money."[14] The quip drew a swift condemnation from the National Iranian Affairs Committee (NIAC). "The 18 million Iranians who defied the odds and voted for change in this year's presidential elections might take issue with Senator Kirk's insulting characterization," said NIAC policy director Jamal Abdi, referring to the election of Iranian President Hassan Rouhani, who campaigned in 2013 on reaching a diplomatic accord with the West. "Kirk has been more effective than any regime hardliner in convincing the Iranian people that, no matter what they do, the U.S. government will stand against them."[15]¶ "Making ignorant and belligerent comments about Iran has now become a form of Republican electioneering," quipped a writer for the American Conservative. "If this is what passes for foreign policy thinking among top Republicans, the party is in a very bad way."[16]¶ Previously, Kirk co-authored, along with Sen. Joseph Lieberman (I-CT) and Sen. Robert Menendez (D-NJ), Iran sanctions legislation that passed the Senate in late November 2012. According to the Wall Street Journal, the sanctions, which were attached to the National Defense Authorization Act, “target Iran’s energy, shipping and shipbuilding sectors, already in the sights of U.S. sanctions. But the legislation goes further, restricting trade with Iran in precious metals, graphite, aluminum and steel, metallugrical coal and software for integrating industrial processes.”[17]¶ In 2011, Kirk spearheaded a campaign aimed at pressuring President Obama to adopt Iran sanctions that observers argued Tehran could interpret as an act of war. The proposed sanctions, targeting Iran’s central bank, were supported by most Senate members and applauded by key elements of the “pro-Israel” lobby, including the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC). In a press release, the lobby stated: “AIPAC applauds today’s bipartisan letter—signed by 92 U.S. Senators—to the administration urging it to sanction the Central Bank of Iran (CBI), or Bank Markazi. The letter, spearheaded by Senators Charles Schumer (D-NY) and Mark Kirk (R-IL), notes that the CBI lies at the center of Iran’s strategy to circumvent international sanctions against its illicit nuclear program.” (For more on the sanctions, see “New Iran Sanctions: Following the ‘Yellowcake’ Road to War,” Right Web, August 12, 2011.)¶ Kirk was also a leading supporter of the 2009 Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act, which according the Congressional Research Service would prevent the United States "from providing credit, insurance, or guarantees to any project controlled by any energy producers or refiners that contribute significantly to Iran's refined petroleum resources.”[18] Although loudly promoted by Kirk and other hardline “pro-Israel” figures,[19] the bill was sharply criticized by many observers, who claimed it would “hurt the Iranian people while having little effect on the leadership sanctions are supposed to put pressure on; undermine the Obama administration's attempts at engagement with Iran under a multilateral negotiating framework; and isolate the U.S. by antagonizing crucial allies in the UN Security Council.”[20] A version of the bill was eventually passed and signed by President Obama in July 2010.

#### That triggers Iran prolif and escalating war.

Costello 15. [Ryan, Policy Fellow @ NIAC, former Program Associate at the Connect US Fund on nuclear nonproliferaiton policy, "Stakes are high for Iran nuclear negotiations" National Iranian Council – March 30 -- www.niacouncil.org/stakes-are-high-for-iran-nuclear-negotiations/]

This week, the U.S. has a chance to lead an international coalition into an agreement that would guard against any attempt by Iran to obtain a nuclear weapon. However, the decades since the Iranian Revolution in 1979 are littered with missed opportunities to resolve differences between the U.S. and Iran, including on the nuclear issue. With political capital expended to keep the negotiations afloat, particularly in Washington, and the list of issues to be resolved shrinking, these negotiations have steadily risen in importance. As a result, failure or the rash rejection of a breakthrough by Congress or Iranian hardliners could result in irreparable damage to the diplomatic track, with profound consequences for an already chaotic region.∂ We may never see a pair of U.S. and Iranian Presidents more willing to expend the political capital necessary to reach a nuclear deal. President Obama famously distinguished himself on the campaign trail in 2008 by vowing to sit down with any world leader without preconditions, including Iran, and has turned an Iran nuclear deal into what could be the chief foreign policy goal of his second term. Secretary of State John Kerry and other top U.S. diplomats have also spent countless hours doggedly pursuing a deal that balances between the political imperatives of Washington and Tehran.∂ In Iran, President Rouhani campaigned on a platform of moderation and outreach to the West. Rouhani was the lead nuclear negotiator for Iran between 2003-2005, which resulted in Iran freezing its enrichment and implementing the IAEA’s Additional Protocol. Rouhani’s foreign minister, Mohammad Javad Zarif, also has a successful track record of negotiating with the West, playing a critical role in the effort to form a new government for Afghanistan at the Bonn conference in 2001. Over the past year and a half of intense negotiations, Rouhani and Zarif have kept Iran’s skeptical Supreme Leader united behind their efforts to reach a deal, preventing counterproductive divides in Iran’s political elite.∂ Now, with the political scales tilted heavily in favor of diplomacy, failure could eliminate diplomatic prospects for the foreseeable future. Escalation will be the name of the game if negotiations fail, as lead U.S. negotiator Wendy Sherman articulated in October. Congress would pass sanctions and President Obama might not put up much of a fight. Iran would expand its nuclear program and limit the access of international inspectors. The sanctions regime would fray or potentially collapse, diminishing U.S. leverage over Iran. Tacit cooperation in Iraq to counter ISIS militants could end, with dangerous consequences.∂ If diplomacy fails, President Obama would likely resist the reinvigorated calls from neoconservative circles to attack Iran, but he has less than two years remaining in office. Prominent Republicans weighing Presidential runs have already staked out a hardline position by warning Iran that they would undo any potential multilateral nuclear agreement “with the stroke of a pen.” Democrats, as well, could be scarred by failure and rush toward a hawkish position. Whereas a multilateral agreement would constrain the next President from returning to the escalation route, an advancing Iranian nuclear program and the lack of diplomatic prospects would tempt many of Obama’s potential successors to consider the military option, regardless of the consequences. Those who have dreamed of attacking Tehran ever since the fall of Baghdad are banking on such an opportunity to renew their case for yet another disastrous war.∂ It has been ten years since the European 3 (the United Kingdom, France and Germany) had a golden opportunity to constrain Iran’s nuclear program. Those talks fell apart largely due to the George W. Bush administration’s insistence that any agreement result in Iran eliminating its entire centrifuge program. As a result, Iran went from hundreds to 20,000 centrifuges as economic pressure escalated but failed to achieve any strategic goal. Now, diplomacy has once again halted the Iranian program’s advance and could lead to a historic breakthrough that reshapes the U.S.-Iran relationship, cuts off Iran’s pathways to a nuclear weapon and averts a disastrous war. If an agreement falls through, however, getting through another ten years without a war, an Iranian nuclear weapon, or both would likely prove more challenging than reaching the diplomatic inflection point that the parties now face in Lausanne.

# \*\*Uniqueness

### 2NC Independents Module

#### Duckworth is going to win now, but the race is close – polling data from both sides prove – Kirk’s only chance is to drum up fear and flip independents

Chicago Sun-Times 16 [Lynn Sweet; Washington Bureau Chief, Chicago Sun-Times, master's from Northwestern University's Medill School of Journalism. She received her undergraduate degree from the University of California at Berkeley; 04/05/2016, 09:30am; Kirk, Duckworth in statistical tie: New Kirk Illinois Senate poll; http://chicago.suntimes.com/news/kirk-duckworth-in-statistical-tie-new-kirk-illinois-senate-poll///TPB]

WASHINGTON — Sen. Mark Kirk, R-Ill., and his rival Rep. Tammy Duckworth, D-Ill., are in a statistical tie, according to a new Kirk poll, with Duckworth slightly ahead and Kirk’s role in the Merrick Garland Supreme Court fight burnishing an independent image.¶ The Kirk campaign shared some of the poll findings with the Chicago Sun-Times, but not the entire survey. Kirk is considered one of the most at-risk Senate Republicans up this cycle, running in a state expected to produce a heavy Democratic presidential vote in November, no matter who the nominees are.¶ It’s unusual for any findings of a poll to be released showing an incumbent behind. But the Kirk campaign, in a difficult political climate in Illinois, wants to send the message that the Senate race is in play.¶ Indeed, hours after I broke a story about the poll on Tuesday morning, both Kirk and Duckworth sent out email fundraising appeals pegged to the survey. Duckworth’s pitch: She needs money to keep her lead. Kirk’s request for contributions in his email said though “locked in a statistical tie,” “Mark has all the momentum.”¶ The Senate survey, by Kirk’s pollsters, the GS Strategy Group, was of 600 likely general election voters and taken March 30-31, after Kirk and Duckworth won their party nominations in the March 15 primary.¶ In the direct matchup, Duckworth led 42.7 percent to 39.6 percent for Kirk, with about 18 percent undecided.¶ The survey’s margin of error is plus or minus 4 percentage points. I was given a copy of a GS Strategy Group memo about the Kirk poll and I was provided with some supplemental information.¶ The Illinois Senate contest “remains incredibly tight,” GS founder Greg Strimple wrote in his memo.¶ Duckworth pollster Jill Normington, writing a rebuttal memo, concluded that the Kirk poll memo release “is a clear sign that Kirk is in trouble, and that his only hope is to scare voters. His internal numbers show him to be weak.”¶ To win a second term, Kirk will need an outpouring of independent and crossover Democratic votes.

#### Majority of Independents strongly dislike free trade and foreign engagement

**Public Citizen 15** (a nonprofit organization that does not participate in partisan political activities or endorse any candidates for elected office, split into five policy groups: our Congress Watch division, the Energy Program, Global Trade Watch, the Health Research Group and our Litigation Group; 2015; U.S. Polling Shows Strong Opposition to More of the Same U.S. Trade Deals from Independents, Republicans and Democrats Alike, <https://www.citizen.org/documents/polling-memo.pdf>, July) WP

Forty percent of Americans – including 42 percent of Republicans and 45 percent of independents – said that “free trade agreements – like NAFTA, and the policies of the World Trade Organization” (WTO) have been “a bad thing” for the United States, while 10-15 percent less of each demographic said they have been a good thing. This is a dramatic reversal from a 2004 poll in which Americans believed that these trade agreements have been a good thing, by a 47-34 margin.  Only 4 percent of Americans believed that these policies have helped the financial situation of them and their family; and only 11 and 13 percent respectively believed that they have led to higher wages and more jobs. By contrast, 33 percent didn’t even believe that these policies lower the price of products that they buy – a key claim of NAFTA-WTO supporters.

### Yes Duckworth – Laundry List

#### Polls, demographics, history, and funding all show a strong Duckworth win in November

Enten 16 Harry Enten, writer at fivethirtyeight, 2016 (“Senate 2016: The Democrats Strike Back,” Fivethirtyeight, June 6th, <http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/senate-2016-the-democrats-strike-back/>, 6/22/16 WP

Illinois¶ Candidates: Republican Sen. Mark Kirk is facing Democrat Tammy Duckworth¶ Cook rating: Tossup¶ Rothenberg/Gonzales rating: Lean Democrat¶ Chance of Democratic victory: 77 percent¶ This is one of the two most likely seats to flip this year. Kirk was first elected to the Senate in the 2010 Republican wave. He has the profile of a Republican who can win in Illinois: moderate and from the lakeshore. Kirk’s problem is that Illinois is a solidly blue state, especially in a presidential year. No Democratic presidential candidate has won the state by less than 10 percentage points from 1992 through 2012.¶ Democrats also benefit from having a strong candidate in Duckworth, a House member and Iraq War veteran. Duckworth is about as moderate as Kirk, according to their voting records, and had more cash on hand than Kirk through the first quarter of this year,3 despite Kirk’s strong fundraising. She’s also less likely to fly off the handle — Kirk has been known to make controversial statements. Don’t sell Kirk short, though: He’s won a number of tough races and is a fighter (witness his comeback from a stroke). But at the end of the day, he’s fighting Illinois’s Democratic lean more than Duckworth. He’s trailed in the few polls that have been conducted, including being down 3 percentage points in a survey released by his own campaign. If Kirk holds on in Illinois, it’s probably a sign that Republicans are keeping the Senate.

### Yes Duckworth – Funding

#### Duckworth is going to win – GOP funding has abandoned Kirk because empirics show him losing

RCP 6/3/16 [James Arkin; master’s and bachelor’s degree from the Medill School of Journalism at Northwestern University; June 03, 2016; GOP Groups Not Spending on Sen. Kirk in Illinois; http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2016/06/03/gop\_groups\_not\_spending\_on\_sen\_kirk\_in\_illinois\_130760.html//TPB]

Republican outside groups have spent tens of millions of dollars in competitive Senate races this year, eager to protect GOP incumbents in a difficult cycle with the chamber’s majority up for grabs. But as that spending has ramped up in recent weeks, next to none has gone to bolster Illinois Sen. Mark Kirk, widely viewed as the most vulnerable of them all. ¶ Through the entire 2016 cycle, the outside spending on Kirk’s behalf represents just a fraction of the total money spent on GOP incumbents, and significantly lags behind the amount spent to back his colleagues in tough races. And as groups strategize and lock in future spending, so far there appear to be no plans to put big money behind the Illinois lawmaker’s re-election campaign against Democratic Rep. Tammy Duckworth.¶ For some of these Republican groups, it’s a simple calculation: Illinois is a deeply blue state in presidential election years, and with so many other competitive races in battleground states, investing there may not be the best use of resources.¶ “It is an enormously difficult state to be a Republican running statewide in a presidential year,” said one party operative who works for an outside group and who requested anonymity to discuss strategy. “I think you could bring Abraham Lincoln back from the dead to try for the Senate seat and he would have trouble in 2016, or he would be a decided underdog in 2016.”

### Yes Duckworth – A2: Trial

#### Duckworth will win – trial has been settled – spinning it back on Kirk

Chicago Tribune 6/24/16 [Rick Pearson; Workplace lawsuit against Tammy Duckworth settled; June 24, 2016; http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/local/breaking/ct-tammy-duckworth-lawsuit-settled-met-0626-20160624-story.html//TPB]

A potentially politically embarrassing civil lawsuit against Democratic U.S. Senate candidate Tammy Duckworth, alleging workplace retaliation during her time as head of the state Department of Veterans Affairs, was settled Friday for $26,000 from the state, with no finding of wrongdoing.¶ Attorney General Lisa Madigan's office, representing Duckworth in the case, said in a statement that during a pre-trial settlement conference in Downstate Union County "it became clear that we could resolve this matter... for nuisance value — saving the state the costs of lawyers preparing for and trying the case."¶ Madigan spokeswoman Maura Possley said the $26,000 award to two workers at the Anna Veteran's Home "will cover attorney's fees and all costs," and the "settlement is based on the agreement that there is no finding of a violation of the law."¶ The lawsuit, which had been scheduled for trial mid-August, had been the dominant theme of Republican U.S. Sen. Mark Kirk's early attacks on Duckworth, currently a two-term congresswoman from Hoffman Estates, as he seeks re-election.¶ Kirk has been considered the most vulnerable of Republicans seeking re-election this year. Illinois traditionally goes Democratic in presidential years and the first-term senator has revoked his earlier endorsement of controversial presumptive Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump — and has been airing a TV ad to promote it — to try to mitigate any political fallout in November.¶ Duckworth had been appointed to head the state's veteran's agency by now-imprisoned former Gov. Rod Blagojevich following an unsuccessful run for Congress against U.S. Rep. Peter Roskam of Wheaton in 2006.¶ The Blagojevich connection, and allegations raised in the lawsuit, had prompted Kirk to accuse her of hiring "goombahs" at the former governor's direction, and he questioned whether she wanted to avoid testifying. Duckworth has said she wanted to get all the facts out but was prevented from speaking about the case while it was being litigated.¶ Matt McGrath, Duckworth's campaign spokesman, called the settlement "appropriate for what was always a frivolous workplace case" and said she "has and always will put protecting our veterans first."¶ "Kirk had clearly pinned his desperate campaign hopes on what a federal judge (once) deemed a 'garden variety workplace case,' and now it's clear he's got nothing left to offer Illinois families," McGrath said.

#### Duckworth trial is over – it was Kirk’s key distraction for his trial that flips momentum

AP 6/24/16 [THE ASSOCIATED PRESS; JUNE 24, 2016, 7:07 P.M. E.D.T. The Latest: Workplace Lawsuit Against Duckworth Settled; http://www.nytimes.com/aponline/2016/06/24/us/politics/ap-us-senate-2016-illinois-lawsuit-the-latest.html//TPB]

JONESBORO, Ill. — The Latest on a settlement of a workplace retaliation lawsuit filed against U.S. Rep. Tammy Duckworth of Illinois(all times local):¶ 6 p.m.¶ The campaigns of U.S. Senate candidate Tammy Duckworth and U.S. Senator Mark Kirk are reacting to a $26,000 settlement of a workplace retaliation lawsuit filed against Duckworth.¶ The Illinois attorney general's office said Friday that the case was settled at "nuisance value" and that there was no finding of any violation of law.¶ The Democratic congresswoman's campaign said the settlement was "appropriate" for what it called a "frivolous" workplace case. But the campaign for the Republican senator asserted that Duckworth would not have settled the case if she were not guilty.¶ The attorney general's office represented Duckworth in the case. Two employees of a home for veterans alleged Duckworth violated state ethics laws by taking action against them when she was head of the Illinois Department of Veterans Affairs.¶ This item has been corrected to reflect that the Illinois attorney general's office said the case was settled at "nuisance value" and that there was no finding of any violation of law.¶ \_\_\_¶ 5:40 p.m.¶ A settlement in the workplace retaliation lawsuit against U.S. Senate candidate Tammy Duckworth has concluded with an agreement that no law was violated.¶ The settlement removes what has been a distraction for the Democratic congresswoman is challenging Republican U.S. Sen. Mark Kirk in one of November's most competitive Senate races.¶ The Illinois attorney general's office announced the agreement Friday after a hearing in Union County. The office represented Duckworth in the case.¶ Two employees of a home for veterans alleged Duckworth violated state ethics laws by taking action against them when she was head of the Illinois Department of Veterans Affairs.¶ Duckworth's supporters called the case a politically motivated nuisance lawsuit.

# \*\*Links

### Link – Foreign Policy Independents

#### Independents are focused on foreign policy, and dislike it.

Larison 16 — Daniel Larison, Daniel Larison is a senior editor at TAC, where he also keeps a solo blog. He has been published in the New York Times Book Review, Dallas Morning News, Orthodox Life, Front Porch Republic, The American Scene, and Culture11, and is a columnist for The Week. He holds a PhD in history from the University of Chicago, 2016(“Americans Don’t Want a More Aggressive Foreign Policy,” The American Conservative, May 26, <http://www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/americans-dont-want-a-more-aggressive-foreign-policy/>, 06/24/2016, EC)

Pew released a survey earlier this month on American attitudes on foreign policy and America’s role in the world. Notably, only 27% said that they thought the U.S. does too little in trying to solve world problems: Shifting partisan opinions on U.S. efforts to solve global problems There is still not much support for a more activist foreign policy, and a plurality (41%) continues to say that the U.S. does too much around the world. This figure is significantly lower than it was three years ago before the ISIS panic, but even during the summer of 2014 it didn’t drop below 39%. Those saying the U.S. does “too little” haven’t been more than a third of respondents in any of the surveys over the last three years. There are a few other interesting details. Republicans and independents are both more likely than Democrats to say that the U.S. is doing too much abroad, while a plurality of Democrats is satisfied with the current level of involvement. No doubt the fact that the president is from their party makes more of them comfortable approving of how much the U.S. is doing right now. More Republicans and independents say that the U.S. does too much rather than too little, but a minority also think the U.S. should do more. Relatively few from either group wants to keep things as they are.

#### Independents think the US is to focused on foreign policy, and its disadvantageous to America

Newsmax 16 — Cathy Burke, Newsmax Journalist, 2016(“Poll: USA Needs to Put Itself First”, Newsmax, May 9, [http://www.newsmax.com/US/rasmussen-poll-foreign-policy-america-first/2016/05/09/id/727924/#ixzz4CWUwwO65](http://www.newsmax.com/US/rasmussen-poll-foreign-policy-america-first/2016/05/09/id/727924/" \l "ixzz4CWUwwO65), 06/24/2016, EC)

A strong majority of voters believe in an America-first foreign policy and feel the nation should put its own interests ahead of those of other countries, a new poll shows. The Rasmussen Reports survey, released Monday, finds 60 percent of respondents agree with the statement: "No country has ever prospered that failed to put its own interests first. Both our friends and enemies put their countries above ours, and we, while being fair to them, must do the same." The survey finds 17 percent disagree with the statement, and 23 percent are unsure. According to the poll, 30 percent of voters believe U.S. foreign policy in recent years has put America first, but twice as many, 60 percent, say America has been more interested in the rights of those in other countries. The poll's margin of error is plus or minus 3 percentage points. GOP presumptive presidential nominee Donald Trump's declaration of an "America first" foreign policy last month became a provocative issue in some circles — including among the Senate's leading Republican voices on national security. In other findings, the poll finds: 50 percent of Democrats, 13 percent of Republicans, and 26 percent of independents think U.S. foreign policy in recent years has put America first; 82 percent of GOP voters and 62 percent of independents believe America's foreign policy has been more interested in the rights of those in other countries; only 37 percent of Democrats agree with that. 52 percent of Democrats agree with Trump's statement, along with 71 percent of Republicans and 56 percent of independents; 23 percent of Democrats disagree, compared with 12 percent of 12 percent of Republicans and 16 percent of independents.

### Link Uniqueness – Obama popularity high

#### Link UQ Obama’s approval rating is near or over 50% now

Chicago Tribune 3/30/16 [Jonathan Bernstein; doctorate at the University of California at Berkeley, he taught at the University of Texas at San Antonio and DePauw University; March 30, 2016; Bloomberg View; Obama's rising popularity is good news for Democrats; http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/opinion/commentary/ct-barack-obama-approval-rating-hillary-clinton-20160330-story.html//TPB]

President Barack Obama's surging approval rating is becoming a major plot line of the 2016 election.¶ Obama has reached 53 percent approval from Gallup, a three-year high, and he's been at or above 50 percent in that survey for four weeks.¶ HuffPollster's aggregate of all current polls gives Obama an average approval rating of 49.2 percent, compared with 47.3 percent disapproval. He bottomed out in the first week of December at 44.1 percent, according to that estimate, so he's gained five percentage points over an almost four-month sustained rally.

### Link – Trade 2NC

#### Pointing out opponents support for trade policy tanks them – more than job outsourcing, and tax cuts comparatively

**Public Citizen 15** (a nonprofit organization that does not participate in partisan political activities or endorse any candidates for elected office, split into five policy groups: our Congress Watch division, the Energy Program, Global Trade Watch, the Health Research Group and our Litigation Group; 2015; U.S. Polling Shows Strong Opposition to More of the Same U.S. Trade Deals from Independents, Republicans and Democrats Alike, <https://www.citizen.org/documents/polling-memo.pdf>, July//TPB)

Broad Opposition to Status Quo Trade Policy Has Been Consistent in Recent Years: The findings of¶ recent polls confirm earlier results showing that Americans see our trade policy playing a major role in¶ putting workers behind. In January 2011, most Americans said they believed the trend towards a global¶ economy was bad for the country, compared with 60 percent who said it was good in 2001.33¶ In 2010, while testing Democratic messages for voter response, Democratic polling firm Greenberg¶ Quinlan Rosner Research found that 45 percent of voters were much more likely or somewhat more likely¶ to support a Democratic candidate if he or she were to highlight an opponent’s support of the Colombia,¶ Panama and South Korea FTAs.34 Of four possible messages, the anti-FTA message was just as powerful¶ in swaying voters as a statement in support of tax cuts for the middle class rather than the rich. The antiFTA¶ message was more powerful than a message on opposing tax breaks for companies outsourcing¶ American jobs and statements linking the opposing candidate to former President Bush’s policies.¶ An NBC News-Wall Street Journal poll in 2010 found that 53 percent of Americans believed that FTAs¶ have hurt the United States, up from 32 percent in 1999, with the shift mostly attributable to a change in¶ thinking by upper-income Americans. Only 17 percent in 2010 believed that FTAs have benefited the¶ United States. When the same poll was conducted in 2007, 46 percent of respondents believed FTAs were¶ harmful compared to 28 percent who believed they were helpful. In other words, sentiment against FTAs¶ shifted from a 3-to-2 margin in 2007 to a 3-to-1 margin in 2010. Among self-identified Tea Party¶ supporters, 61 percent believed FTAs have hurt the United States, while “among those earning $75,000 or¶ more, 50 percent said free-trade pacts have hurt the U.S., up from 24 percent who said the same in¶ 1999.”35¶ Repeated polls have found trade-related outsourcing to be the foremost problem on the minds of U.S.¶ voters. During an election cycle focused on job creation, a July 2012 poll conducted by the Mellman¶ Group and North Star Opinion Research asked voters to name “the single biggest obstacle for creating manufacturing jobs in America today.” “Our trade policies encourage outsourcing” was the top¶ response.36 Similarly, a September 2010 NBC News-Wall Street Journal poll found that the impact of¶ trade and outsourcing was one of the only issues on which Americans of different classes, occupations¶ and political persuasions agree. Eighty-six percent said outsourcing of jobs by U.S. firms to low-wage¶ foreign nations is a top cause of our economic woes – by far the top concern, with deficits and health care¶ costs well behind. Interestingly, the only causes that got a majority of support were related to corporate¶ greed, not excessive regulation. Sixty-nine percent of Americans thought that “free trade agreements¶ between the United States and other countries cost the U.S. jobs” – a new high for “free trade” opposition.¶ Among those surveyed, Republicans were even more concerned than Democrats. Also noteworthy is that¶ those who found no real impact from trade deals overtook those who felt that trade deals have been¶ beneficial.¶ 37

### Link – China – General – 2NC

#### National political psyche, gut voter reaction and critics spin ties the plan to full scope of ALL economic and security fears about China – it’s a key issue for voters

Gross, 13 --- Donald, Donald Gross is a lawyer, business strategist and policy expert who also serves as an adjunct fellow of Pacific Forum CSIS, a non-profit research institute affiliated with the Center for Strategic and International Studies. A former State Department official, he developed and implemented U.S. policy on strategic trade, national security and foreign relations. Earlier, he was Director of Legislative Affairs at the National Security Council in the White House and Counselor of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, “The China Fallacy”, http://www.donaldgross.net/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/The-China-Fallacy-Excerpts.pdf

Following the collapse of the Soviet empire in 1989, Americans began to worry deeply about another threat to the well-being of their country: the People’s Republic of China. Though the United States became the world’s only superpower at the end of the Cold War, strategists and analysts continued to search for dangers that might arise in the future. Among states that could potentially become big-power adversaries, China led the pack. Without doubt, the “China threat” today resonates deeply in the national political psyche, as Americans worry about China displacing the U.S. in Asia, taking U.S. manufacturing jobs, carrying out industrial espionage, modernizing its military forces, hacking into computers, and causing a multitude of other problems. Not so long ago, Americans considered another country to be the United States’ most dangerous adversary. During the Cold War, only the Soviet Union seemed to have the power and desire to unleash a devastating nuclear attack on cities and strategic targets across the U.S. Few seriously questioned the U.S.S.R. was masterminding an international communist conspiracy that threatened the “American way of life.” Though anticommunist fears peaked during the McCarthy period of the early 1950s, the ideological struggle continued through the Cuban missile crisis, the Vietnam War, the era of Glasnost, the break-up of the Soviet Union and beyond. While most Americans would admit that China does not possess the military prowess of Russia and is not actively seeking to export its ideological views around the world, many believe the U.S. should do all it can to prepare for an “inevitable” military conflict with China. They think it is only prudent to build up U.S. military bases and forces in the Pacific, in the face of China’s continuing military modernization. They are inclined to support U.S. trade policies imposing tariffs, quotas and other protectionist measures on Chinese imports that enter the country “illegally.” While they cannot help buying low-cost Chinese goods and enjoying low interest rates resulting from China’s large holdings of U.S. Treasury securities, they condemn policies that led the American government to borrow billions of dollars from China. On a gut level, many people fear “cheap Chinese labor” will cause the decline of the United States economy and that U.S. industry will continue to suffer from China’s “unfair trade practices.” From a values standpoint, Americans feel most comfortable when their leaders strongly criticize China for violating human rights and restricting political freedoms. Most believe in their hearts that China’s Communist Party still reverberates with the thoughts of Chairman Mao and that the Party is only willing to incrementally cede political controls through force or necessity. With so many reasons to fear, despise and worry about China, Americans nevertheless cannot help admiring China’s accomplishments and being intrigued with this emerging power. Many watched the opening and closing ceremonies for the 2008 Olympic Games and came away deeply impressed by the brilliant spectacle. Most cannot help but admire and be inspired by China’s achievement of raising more than 400 million people out of poverty, virtually wiping out widespread illiteracy, developing a large middle class and creating a dynamic, consumer society. Many realized that China was a different place altogether from the impoverished, dispirited and totalitarian country they had heard about for years. Nevertheless, most Americans shook their heads knowingly when television commentators dutifully noted that Chinese authorities sharply limited demonstrations and dissent in Beijing during the Olympics. They could not help but feel sympathy for Tibetans whose protests were violently suppressed only weeks earlier by the Chinese military (just as most Americans felt compassion for blind dissident Chen Guangcheng, who sought refuge and protection at the U.S. Embassy in Beijing in late April 2012). Looking back, the drumbeat of critical views about China among American academics, policy experts and journalists gathered strength during the Clinton administration and has continued to the present day. The “China threat” has many security, economic and political dimensions that experts frequently cite to justify their fears. On security matters, some critics assert, as an article of faith, that China is bent on pushing the U.S. out of Asia and eventually dominating the world. These “China hawks” argue that China could move at any time to forcibly occupy Taiwan and reunify the island with the mainland. Such a successful attack on Taiwan, bolstered by explicit and implied military threats against other countries in East Asia, would enable China to dominate the region as a whole. China would then double down on its ultimate goal, this reasoning goes: replacing the United States as the world’s only superpower. From the standpoint of the China hawks, a war between the United States and China is inevitable, since the U.S. stands in the way of China achieving its strategic objectives. Regarding China’s threat to U.S. jobs and economic growth, critics with strong protectionist views argue that the sharp increase in the United States trade deficit with China has had a devastating impact on American workers, causing the loss of nearly 2.8 million jobs between 2001 and 2010.1 They claim that China has unfairly achieved its large bilateral trade surplus with the United States, which reached approximately $295 billion in 2011, because in their view, China couples its aggressive export strategy with measures to manipulate and artificially undervalue its currency, giving Chinese products an unfair advantage in foreign markets.2 While both China hawks and protectionists condemn China for its one-party communist regime, lack of democracy and poor human rights record, they largely accept the country’s domestic political situation as an inalterable fact. Though they may hope for China’s eventual transition to full democracy and high human rights standards, their primary concern is protecting the United States against the threat that China poses to America’s security and economic well-being. shaping u.s. policy In many respects, it is the views of the China hawks that have informed ongoing American security policy toward China over the last decade. During the George W. Bush administration, the U.S. initiated a major buildup of forces in the Pacific as part of what it officially termed to be “hedging” against a potential Chinese military threat. Under the rubric of preparing for the “contingency” of a war with China, U.S. hedging has effectively amounted to a containment strategy. Beyond significantly increasing the number of naval, air and land forces at U.S. bases in the Pacific, the buildup strengthened close-in naval intelligence gathering along China’s coast as well as extensive air force surveillance and reconnaissance of the country as a whole. The Obama Administration hardened this policy through measures it announced in November 2011 that accelerate the strategic encirclement of China, including deploying U.S. marines to Australia’s northern territory and adopting a new “Air Sea Battle Concept” to carry out long-range strikes deep inside China in the event of war. Though the Bush administration, by encouraging market reform and promoting U.S. investment, pursued “engagement” with China on economic matters, it increasingly adopted restrictive trade measures such as imposing extensive import duties on Chinese products. Under pressure from protectionists in Congress, Bush officials moved to this more combative posture in their second term in the belief that China was benefiting unfairly from liberalized trade.3 The Obama Administration supported and magnified this approach. Preeminently, U.S. policy relies on trade measures called “anti-dumping” actions that penalize Chinese companies for allegedly selling their products in the U.S. market at below the cost of production. The Obama Administration also imposed high punitive tariffs on some Chinese products and created a new “enforcement unit” to ramp up U.S. investigations of Chinese trade practices. While critics often lament internal political conditions in China, they are far more focused on security and economic issues. The broad lack of interest in strengthening China’s democracy and human rights practices had a definitive policy impact during the Bush administration and remains in place during the Obama Administration: aside from cataloging political abuses and shortcomings in an annual State Department report, addressing individual cases of concern and making periodic official statements that emphasize American political values, the U.S. government does little that will effectively promote democracy and human rights in China.4 The views of critics who deeply fear a “China threat” have unduly shaped U.S. government policy and anaesthetized Americans to its weaknesses. To many people, United States security policy toward China seems prudently designed to prepare for an uncertain future. Given widespread fear of the threat China might someday pose, many Americans see strengthening defenses in the Asia Pacific as a matter of common sense. On economic issues, many believe it is only fair for the U.S. government to protect American jobs and manufacturers against purportedly nefarious Chinese commercial practices. If this policy sometimes requires confronting China over trade issues, they are willing to live with the consequences. Finally, while most Americans broadly dislike China’s authoritarian political system, they show little overall interest in adopting policies to help move it toward greater democracy and protection of human rights.

### Link – China – Econ – 2NC

#### Stats and Best studies prove the DA – voter belief and perception mean link is immediate – trade ruins democrats in congressional elections

Dizikes, 16 --- Peter Dizikes , MIT News Office, Interview w David Autor, Professor @ MIT, “3 Questions: David Autor on global trade and political polarization”, 4/26, http://news.mit.edu/2016/3-questions-david-autor-globe-trade-political-polarization-0426

Study finds relationship between U.S. job losses due to trade, and political polarization in Congress. In recent years economic studies have illuminated the extent to which global trade agreements, while benefitting many consumers, have also led to significant job losses in the U.S. — particularly due to jobs moving to China after 2001. Now a new study co-authored by MIT economist David Autor (along with non-MIT colleagues David Dorn, Gordon Hanson, and Kaveh Majlesi) identifies a political effect from this economic process. From 2002 through 2010, in U.S. congressional districts particularly affected by job losses due to trade, elected members of the House of Representatives became more ideologically extreme, with moderates consistently losing out in both parties. Autor spoke to MIT News this week about the headline-grabbing results. Q. Your new working paper establishes a strong relationship between job losses in the U.S. due to global trade, and political changes in the U.S. Congress — but the phenomenon at work is not what many people might guess. What did you find? A. There’s been a 30-year trend of rising polarization in the U.S. Congress. A lot of areas economically affected by rising trade exposure, especially in the South, have also been moving politically to the right. We wondered if these economic shocks might be contributing to the political factionalization. There are multiple ways this could work. One would be an anti-incumbent effect: It’s well established that politicians are punished for bad economic outcomes. But we don’t find that. Another possibility might be that the effects of trade shocks would just strongly favor one party over another. But the answer there is also no, not really. However, if you look at ideology rather than party, you do see very sharp movements. But they’re movements across ideological space. So moderate Democrats and moderate Republicans are being voted out of office in trade-exposed areas and being replaced with much more ideologically ardent substitutes. A lot of these gains are on the right. But that’s not entirely the case. If you look at initially Democratic voting districts, you see a very sharp movement to the left — as well as, to some degree, gains for Republicans in some of those districts. So you see this polarization occurring where moderates of both parties are being removed in trade-affected areas, and are being replaced by candidates who win by smaller margins and have more ideological views. Q. Is it fair to say this also corresponds to the ethnic composition of the voters in these congressional districts? And what accounts for this subtle wrinkle in the findings, in which a few of these districts do flip from the Democrats to the Republicans? A. We haven’t done an overwhelming number of ethnic breakdowns, but the one we did that we thought was useful, was that we broke districts into those where the majority of the population was non-Hispanic white, and those where less than half of the population was non-Hispanic white. There are only 66 districts in the study [out of 435 in Congress] which are majority-minority. But in those cases you see very sharp movements to the left. By contrast, in the areas that are majority non-Hispanic white, all the movement is to the right: Moderate Democrats are removed from office, moderate Republicans are removed from office to a lesser extent, and conservative Republicans make enormous gains. And there are no gains for Democrats. Q. In terms of voter beliefs, what is the mechanism here? What explains how such similar types of job losses due to trade lead to such divergent political outcomes? A. Imagine you have two groups of people, liberals and conservatives, and they share the same objective: They want workers to be employed and protected from the shocks of globalization. And then you have a big [trade] shock, and a lot of people lose employment. You might think everyone should converge on what we should do about that. But you can have a setting where beliefs are sufficiently disjointed, such that the same information is interpreted in completely different ways by people observing it. Say I’m a liberal Democrat and I want workers to be protected. A trade shock might lead me to say, “ This confirms what I suspected. We need a broader social safety net to make sure that workers aren’t too adversely affected.” Now suppose you’re a conservative Republican and you see the same thing. You might say, “ This confirms what I suspected, that we need strong nationalistic policies [such as tariffs] to protect our workers.” People are responding in a schismatic sense to the same underlying phenomena. The 2016 presidential election shows the parties are not able to maintain discipline and stop people from moving to populist solutions [on trade] that most politicians don’t like — they’ve lost control of that dialogue. But our paper makes clear that this process was well under way throughout the 2000s. And in some sense what we’re seeing now in the presidential primary isn’t as surprising in retrospect, because so much of it had already occurred, in congressional votes, along the economic fault lines of areas badly impacted by declining manufacturing.

# \*\*Internal Link

### Internal Link – Obama popularity = key

#### Senate elections ESPECIALLY in Presidential election years are tied to the sitting parties’ President’s approval ratings and Obama’s is high now

Flynn 16 [MIKE FLYNN; Director of Government Affairs¶ Reason Foundation, Director of Government Affairs¶ Berman and Company, Director of Legislation and Policy¶ ALEC; 9 May 2016; Gallup: Obama Approval Edges Past Reelection High; http://www.breitbart.com/2016-presidential-race/2016/05/09/gallup-obama-approval-edges-past-reelection-high]

In November 2012, as President Obama was poised to easily win reelection, his approval rating was 52 percent, while 45 percent of Americans disapproved of Obama’s performance as President. Today, his ratings are 3 points better, with 53 percent of Americans approving and 43 percent disapproving of Obama’s tenure. After a reelection honeymoon period, Obama’s approval rating went upside-down again in late Spring 2013. In 2014, Obama’s approval rating averaged just 46 percent. That year, Republicans captured the U.S. Senate and expanded their political standing in states across the country.¶ His approval rating stayed underwater until this March, when both the Republican and Democrat contests intensified. His current approval bounce follows a familiar pattern. Through almost all of 2012, the year he was reelected, more Americans disapproved of Obama’s handling of the Presidency than approved. It was only in the final month of the reelection campaign, when the election neared, that Obama’s approval rating moved back into positive territory.¶ Obama’s current approval rating of 53 percent is a notch higher than it was when he was reelected. It is also nearing the 57 percent approval rating he earned in 2009, his first year in office. Obama’s improved standing in the eyes of American voters could have a big impact on the Presidential contest in November.

# \*\*Impact

### Impact – Kirk = Sanctions

#### Kirk is key to an Iran sanction bill, he’s writing and sponsoring them

HuffPost 15 [Jessica Schulberg; Foreign Affairs Reporter @ The Huffington Post, master's degree in international politics from American University; Jun 06, 2015; Senators Push Iran Sanctions Extension Ahead Of Nuclear Deal Deadline; http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2015/06/05/iran-sanction-nuclear\_n\_7522890.html//TPB]

WASHINGTON — With less than a month before the deadline for a nuclear deal with Iran, Sens. Mark Kirk (R-Ill.) and Bob Menendez (D-N.J.) filed an amendment to the must-pass defense budget that would extend congressional sanctions against Iran for 10 additional years.¶ If passed, the amendment would extend the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, currently set to expire at the end of 2016, until the end of 2026. These sanctions target Iran’s nuclear program as well as its intercontinental ballistic missiles program and human rights abuses — sanctions related to the latter two issues are not eligible for termination or suspension as part of a final nuclear deal between Iran, the U.S. and its five negotiating partners. The National Iranian American Council has included the 1996 legislation in its list of sanctions that could be relieved in the nuclear agreement.¶ The proposed sanctions extension threatens to complicate the already delicate negotiations currently taking place around Iran’s nuclear program. Under those negotiations, the international community would provide sanctions relief to Iran in exchange for Iran dismantling parts of its nuclear program and limiting others. An agreement of principles has been reached, but the final language must be hammered out by the end of June. Congress has generally given the administration room to negotiate, with the understanding that they ultimately will have final say on the suspension of congressionally enacted sanctions. The latest Kirk-Menendez proposal could disrupt that arrangement by suggesting to the Iranians that the Obama administration cannot control his legislature’s sanctions policy.¶ For that reason, Peter Billerbeck, a former Senate staffer and current policy adviser at a think tank called Third Way, slammed the proposed amendment as “needlessly reckless and premature, especially at this point in the negotiations when we’re at the one-yard line.” He added, “We’re at the most critical stage of talks and it’s the last thing we need.”¶ In a statement echoing Billerbeck’s comments, NIAC noted that Congress has ample time to pass an extension of the 1996 sanctions after the completion of the nuclear negotiations. “Taking action on this matter now, in the middle of negotiations, would be premature and counterproductive,” the group said.¶ In January, Kirk and Menendez introduced a bill that would impose additional sanctions on Iran if negotiators failed to reach a deal by their self-imposed June 30 deadline. President Barack Obama warned that passing the bill in the midst of ongoing nuclear negotiations could derail the entire process. He threatened to veto the legislation, and lobbied Democratic lawmakers to withhold their votes.¶ Despite widespread bipartisan support in the Senate for the sanctions bill, Kirk and Menendez agreed to hold off on their bill until after June, and instead backed a separate bill that cemented Congress’ vote on the suspension of congressionally enacted sanctions in the event of a nuclear deal.¶ The alternate bill, which was signed into law last month, was hailed as a victory by both the Obama administration and Congress. The executive branch said it succeeded in removing controversial sections of the bill that would interfere with the nuclear negotiations. Lawmakers claimed they had secured much-needed oversight of the final agreement.¶ “As several of the bill’s supporters articulated, it ensures Congress will have its chance to weigh in on whether to support or oppose a nuclear deal and on the issue of sanctions, but only once the negotiations are completed,” NIAC said, referring to the new law. “The Kirk-Menendez amendment is one of several offered to the [defense authorization] regarding Iran that represent a breach of that bipartisan promise.”

#### Kirk is going to go all in on Iran sanctions – it’s a boost tied to reelection

Pecquet 16 [Julian Pecquet; MA, Journalism @ University of Missouri-Columbia, Baccalaureat @ Lycee International (St. Germain-en-Laye)

March 20, 2016; Senate takes hard-line tack on Iran sanctions; http://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/originals/2016/03/senate-hardline-iran-sanctions-republicans-bills.html//TPB]

"In January the administration imposed sanctions with very limited teeth because they targeted individuals and companies — procurement networks that Tehran can easily reconstitute,” FDD Executive Director Mark Dubowitz said in a press release. “Only severe new sanctions on those sectors of Iran's economy that support its missile program can change Iran’s strategic calculus.”¶ Separately, Sen. Mark Kirk, R-Ill., introduced legislation that seeks to punish Iran for its alleged human rights violations. The bill in particular singled out the airline Mahan Air, which has been accused of ferrying weapons to forces fighting alongside Bashar al-Assad's army in Syria.¶ "I reject our current posture of willful ignorance and inaction towards Iran's terrorist activities, illegal missile testing, funding Assad’s war, and human rights abuses,” Kirk said in a statement. “The Administration’s response cannot once again be it’s ‘not supposed to be doing that’ as Iran continues to walk all over U.S. foreign policy and the international community.”¶ The Treasury Department has said that it is working to convince European countries to blacklist Mahan Air, which had plans to expand its global presence. Kirk's bill would make that impossible by targeting any "person that provides, directly or indirectly, goods, services, technology, or financial services, including the sale or provision of aircraft or aircraft parts, fuel, ramp assistance, baggage and cargo handling, catering, refueling, ticketing, check-in services, crew handling, or other services related to flight operations, to Mahan Air or its agents or affiliates, or for aircraft of Mahan Air or its agents or affiliates."¶ Both bills are co-sponsored by Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky., and his No. 2, John Cornyn, R-Texas, suggesting they're likely to come up for a floor vote relatively soon. The Banking Committee has jurisdiction over sanctions bills in the Senate, allowing the leadership to entirely bypass Corker's committee.¶ Domestic political considerations augur rapid action in the Senate. The bills could boost the political fortunes of Ayotte and Kirk, who face tough re-election fights against Democratic New Hampshire Gov. Maggie Hassan and Rep. Tammy Duckworth, D-Ill., an Iraq war veteran who lost both legs in combat.

### Impact – Iran Backlash

#### Deal collapse triggers Iran prolif and escalating war.

Costello 15. [Ryan, Policy Fellow @ NIAC, former Program Associate at the Connect US Fund on nuclear nonproliferaiton policy, "Stakes are high for Iran nuclear negotiations" National Iranian Council – March 30 -- www.niacouncil.org/stakes-are-high-for-iran-nuclear-negotiations/]

This week, the U.S. has a chance to lead an international coalition into an agreement that would guard against any attempt by Iran to obtain a nuclear weapon. However, the decades since the Iranian Revolution in 1979 are littered with missed opportunities to resolve differences between the U.S. and Iran, including on the nuclear issue. With political capital expended to keep the negotiations afloat, particularly in Washington, and the list of issues to be resolved shrinking, these negotiations have steadily risen in importance. As a result, failure or the rash rejection of a breakthrough by Congress or Iranian hardliners could result in irreparable damage to the diplomatic track, with profound consequences for an already chaotic region.∂ We may never see a pair of U.S. and Iranian Presidents more willing to expend the political capital necessary to reach a nuclear deal. President Obama famously distinguished himself on the campaign trail in 2008 by vowing to sit down with any world leader without preconditions, including Iran, and has turned an Iran nuclear deal into what could be the chief foreign policy goal of his second term. Secretary of State John Kerry and other top U.S. diplomats have also spent countless hours doggedly pursuing a deal that balances between the political imperatives of Washington and Tehran.∂ In Iran, President Rouhani campaigned on a platform of moderation and outreach to the West. Rouhani was the lead nuclear negotiator for Iran between 2003-2005, which resulted in Iran freezing its enrichment and implementing the IAEA’s Additional Protocol. Rouhani’s foreign minister, Mohammad Javad Zarif, also has a successful track record of negotiating with the West, playing a critical role in the effort to form a new government for Afghanistan at the Bonn conference in 2001. Over the past year and a half of intense negotiations, Rouhani and Zarif have kept Iran’s skeptical Supreme Leader united behind their efforts to reach a deal, preventing counterproductive divides in Iran’s political elite.∂ Now, with the political scales tilted heavily in favor of diplomacy, failure could eliminate diplomatic prospects for the foreseeable future. Escalation will be the name of the game if negotiations fail, as lead U.S. negotiator Wendy Sherman articulated in October. Congress would pass sanctions and President Obama might not put up much of a fight. Iran would expand its nuclear program and limit the access of international inspectors. The sanctions regime would fray or potentially collapse, diminishing U.S. leverage over Iran. Tacit cooperation in Iraq to counter ISIS militants could end, with dangerous consequences.∂ If diplomacy fails, President Obama would likely resist the reinvigorated calls from neoconservative circles to attack Iran, but he has less than two years remaining in office. Prominent Republicans weighing Presidential runs have already staked out a hardline position by warning Iran that they would undo any potential multilateral nuclear agreement “with the stroke of a pen.” Democrats, as well, could be scarred by failure and rush toward a hawkish position. Whereas a multilateral agreement would constrain the next President from returning to the escalation route, an advancing Iranian nuclear program and the lack of diplomatic prospects would tempt many of Obama’s potential successors to consider the military option, regardless of the consequences. Those who have dreamed of attacking Tehran ever since the fall of Baghdad are banking on such an opportunity to renew their case for yet another disastrous war.∂ It has been ten years since the European 3 (the United Kingdom, France and Germany) had a golden opportunity to constrain Iran’s nuclear program. Those talks fell apart largely due to the George W. Bush administration’s insistence that any agreement result in Iran eliminating its entire centrifuge program. As a result, Iran went from hundreds to 20,000 centrifuges as economic pressure escalated but failed to achieve any strategic goal. Now, diplomacy has once again halted the Iranian program’s advance and could lead to a historic breakthrough that reshapes the U.S.-Iran relationship, cuts off Iran’s pathways to a nuclear weapon and averts a disastrous war. If an agreement falls through, however, getting through another ten years without a war, an Iranian nuclear weapon, or both would likely prove more challenging than reaching the diplomatic inflection point that the parties now face in Lausanne.

#### US abandoning the deal causes Iran war.

Beauchamp 14. [Zack, B.A.s in Philosophy and Political Science from Brown University and an M.Sc in International Relations from the London School of Economics, former editor of TP Ideas and a reporter for ThinkProgress.org, "How the new GOP majority could destroy Obama's nuclear deal with Iran" VOX -- November 6 -- www.vox.com/2014/11/6/7164283/iran-nuclear-deal-congress]

And make no mistake — imposing new sanctions or limiting Obama's authority to waive the current ones would kill any deal. If Iran can't expect Obama to follow through on his promises to relax sanctions, it has zero incentive to limit its nuclear program. "If Congress adopts sanctions," Iranian Foreign Minister Javad Zarif told Time last December, "the entire deal is dead."∂ Moreover, it could fracture the international movement to sanction Iran. The United States is far from Iran's biggest trading partner, so it depends on international cooperation in order to ensure the sanctions bite. If it looks like the US won't abide by the terms of a deal, the broad-based international sanctions regime could collapse. Europe, particularly, might decide that going along with the sanctions is no longer worthwhile.∂ "Our ability to coerce Iran is largely based on whether or not the international community thinks that we are the ones that are being constructive and [Iranians] are the ones that being obstructive," Sofer says. "If they don't believe that, then the international sanctions regime falls apart."∂ This could be one of the biggest fights of Obama's last term∂ It's true that Obama could veto any Congressional efforts to blow up an Iran deal with sanctions. lobbying effort that Democrats might prefer to spend pushing on other issues.∂ "I'm not really sure they're going to be willing to take on a fight about an Iran sanctions bill," Sofer concludes. "I'm not really sure that the Democrats who support [a deal] are really fully behind it enough that they'll be willing to give up leverage on, you know, unemployment insurance or immigration status — these bigger issues for most Democrats."∂ So if the new Republican Senate prioritizes destroying an Iran deal, Obama will have to fight very hard to keep it — without necessarily being able to count on his own party for support. And the stakes are enormous: if Iran's nuclear program isn't stopped peacefully, then the most likely outcomes are either Iran going nuclear, or war with Iran.∂ The administration believes a deal with Iran is their only way to avoid this horrible choice. That's why it's been one of the administration's top priorities since day one. It's also why this could become one of the biggest legislative fights of Obama's last two years.

#### Sanctions cause US – Iran war

Shank and Gould 13

Michael Shank, Ph.D., is director of foreign policy at the Friends Committee on National Legislation. Kate Gould is legislative associate for Middle East policy at FCNL, No Iran deal, but significant progress in Geneva, 9/12/13, http://communities.washingtontimes.com/neighborhood/cause-conflict-conclusion/2013/nov/12/no-iran-deal-significant-progress-geneva/

Congress should welcome, not stubbornly dismiss, diplomatic efforts to finalize the interim accord and support the continued conversation to reach a more comprehensive agreement. The sanctions that hawks on the Hill are pushing derail such efforts and increase the prospects of war. ¶ There is, thankfully, a growing bipartisan contingent of Congress who recognizes that more sanctions could undercut the delicate diplomatic efforts underway. Senator Carl Levin, D-Mich., chair of the Senate Armed Services Committee, cautioned early on that, “We should not at this time impose additional sanctions.” ¶ Senator Tim Johnson, D-S.D., chair of the Banking Committee, is still weighing whether to press forward with new sanctions in his committee. Separately, as early as next week, the Senate could vote on Iran sanctions amendments during the chamber’s debate on the must-pass annual defense authorization bill.¶ This caution against new sanctions, coming from these more sober quarters of the Senate, echoes the warnings from a wide spectrum of former U.S. military officials against new sanctions. There is broad recognition by U.S. and Israeli security officials that the military option is not the preferred option; a diplomatic one is. ¶ This widespread support for a negotiated solution was highlighted last week when 79 national security heavyweights signed on to a resounding endorsement of the Obama Administration’s latest diplomatic efforts.¶ Any member of Congress rejecting a diplomatic solution moves the United States toward another war in the Middle East. Saying no to this deal-in-the-works, furthermore, brings the world no closer toward the goal of Iran giving up its entire nuclear program. Rather, it would likely result in an unchecked Iranian enrichment program, while the United States and Iran would teeter perilously close on the brink of war. ¶ A deal to prevent war and a nuclear-armed Iran is within reach and it would be dangerous to let it slip away. Congress can do the right thing here, for America’s security and Middle East’s stability, and take the higher diplomatic road. Pandering to harsh rhetoric and campaign contributors is no way to sustain a foreign policy agenda. It will only make America and her assets abroad less secure, not more. The time is now to curb Iran’s enrichment program as well as Congress’s obstructionism to a peaceful path forward.

### Impact – A2: Iran Conflict Doesn’t Escalate

#### Goes nuclear, extinction

Avery 13

John Scales, Lektor Emeritus, Associate Professor, at the Department of Chemistry, University of Copenhagen, since 1990 he has been the Contact Person in Denmark for Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs, An Attack On Iran Could Escalate Into Global Nuclear War, 11/6/13, http://www.countercurrents.org/avery061113.htm

Despite the willingness of Iran's new President, Hassan Rouhani to make all reasonable concessions to US demands, Israeli pressure groups in Washington continue to demand an attack on Iran. But such an attack might escalate into a global nuclear war, with catastrophic consequences.¶ As we approach the 100th anniversary World War I, we should remember that this colossal disaster escalated uncontrollably from what was intended to be a minor conflict. There is a danger that an attack on Iran would escalate into a large-scale war in the Middle East, entirely destabilizing a region that is already deep in problems.¶ The unstable government of Pakistan might be overthrown, and the revolutionary Pakistani government might enter the war on the side of Iran, thus introducing nuclear weapons into the conflict. Russia and China, firm allies of Iran, might also be drawn into a general war in the Middle East. Since much of the world's oil comes from the region, such a war would certainly cause the price of oil to reach unheard-of heights, with catastrophic effects on the global economy.¶ In the dangerous situation that could potentially result from an attack on Iran, there is a risk that nuclear weapons would be used, either intentionally, or by accident or miscalculation. Recent research has shown that besides making large areas of the world uninhabitable through long-lasting radioactive contamination, a nuclear war would damage global agriculture to such a extent that a global famine of previously unknown proportions would result.¶ Thus, nuclear war is the ultimate ecological catastrophe. It could destroy human civilization and much of the biosphere. To risk such a war would be an unforgivable offense against the lives and future of all the peoples of the world, US citizens included.

### Impact – A2: Deal Fails

#### Consensus of experts agree – the deal solves.

Corn 15. [David, Washington Bureau chief, "The Iranian Nuclear Deal: What the Experts Are Saying" Mother Jones -- April 3 -- www.motherjones.com/politics/2015/04/iran-nuclear-deal-nonproliferation-experts]

Shortly after the participants in the Iranian nuclear talks announced that a double-overtime framework had been crafted, I was on television with Rabbi Shmuley Boteach, who is something of a celebrity rabbi, a failed congressional candidate, and an arch-neoconservative hawk who has been howling about a potential deal with Iran for months. Not surprisingly, he was not pleased by the news of the day. He declared that under these parameters, Iran would give up nothing and would "maintain their entire nuclear apparatus." Elsewhere, a more serious critic, Sen. Tom Cotton (R-Ark.), who last month had organized the letter to Iran's leaders signed by 47 GOP senators opposed to a deal, groused that the framework was "only a list of dangerous US concessions that will put Iran on the path to nuclear weapons."∂ These criticisms were rhetorical bombs, not statements of fact. Under the framework, Iran would give up two-thirds of its centrifuges used to enrich uranium and would reduce its stockpile of low-enriched uranium (which is the raw material used to develop bomb-quality highly-enriched uranium) from 10,000 kilograms to 300 kilograms. These two developments alone—and the framework has many other provisions—would diminish Tehran's ability to produce a nuclear weapon. Its nuclear apparatus would be smaller, and under these guidelines, Iran's pathway to nuclear weapons, while certainly not impossible, would be much more difficult. Yet because politics dominates the debate over this deal—as it does so often with important policy matters—foes of the framework could hurl fact-free charges with impunity.∂ It is perhaps easier to do so when the subject is a highly technical matter. Nuclear nonproliferation is a subject that depends upon science. (Do you know how many centrifuges it takes to spin enough material for a bomb?) And it is difficult for nonexperts to assess any nonproliferation agreement. But it is rather easy to decry Tehran's leaders as evil tyrants who support terrorism, despise Israel, and cannot be trusted. Little of that sort of attack has any bearing on evaluating this framework, which may or may not lead to a concrete accord. Trust is not at issue, for example. What counts is whether the technical means of inspection agreed upon are deemed sufficient to monitor the nuclear program, materials, supply chain, and facilities that remain. Yet who can tell?∂ Well, there are nonproliferation experts. A fair number, in fact. These are scientists and policy mavens who are trained to study and answer the questions posed by this framework. They are not infallible. They may disagree among themselves. But if there ever were a policy debate that should be shaped by scientific expertise, this is it. The politicians, pundits, and, yes, rabbis (or, at least, one rabbi) ought to give due deference to the guys and gals who know this stuff. So I've collected a few initial takes from arms control policy experts who are mostly keen on the possible deal, and here they are:∂ Anthony Cordesman, the Arleigh A. Burke Chair in Strategy at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, a former national security aide to Sen. John McCain, and a former director of intelligence assessment in the Office of the Secretary of Defense: "[T]he proposed parameters and framework in the Proposed Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action has the potential to meet every test in creating a valid agreement over time…It can block both an Iranian nuclear threat and a nuclear arms race in the region, and it is a powerful beginning to creating a full agreement, and creating the prospect for broader stability in other areas. Verification will take at least several years, but some form of trust may come with time. This proposal should not be a subject for partisan wrangling or outside political exploitation. It should be the subject of objective analysis of the agreement, our intelligence and future capabilities to detect Iran's actions, the International Atomic Energy Agency's (IAEA) capabilities to verify, and enforcement provisions if Iran should cheat. No perfect agreement was ever possible and it is hard to believe a better option was negotiable. In fact, it may be a real victory for all sides: A better future for Iran, and greater security for the United States, its Arab partners, Israel, and all its other allies."∂ William Burns, president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, former deputy secretary of state, and former career ambassador in the Foreign Service: "In a perfect world, there would be no nuclear enrichment in Iran, and its existing enrichment facilities would be dismantled. But we don't live in a perfect world. We can't wish or bomb away the basic know-how and enrichment capability that Iran has developed. What we can do is sharply constrain it over a long duration, monitor it with unprecedented intrusiveness, and prevent the Iranian leadership from enriching material to weapons grade and building a bomb…The history of the Iranian nuclear issue is littered with missed opportunities. It is a history in which fixation on the perfect crowded out the good, and in whose rearview mirror we can see deals that look a lot better now than they seemed then. With all its inevitable imperfections, we can't afford to miss this one."∂ Matthew Bunn, professor at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government and coprincipal investigator at the Project on Managing the Atom: In a PowerPoint presentation he notes, "The proposed deal is the best chance to stop an Iranian Bomb. Deal would impose technical barriers that would take overt breakout off the table as a plausible option, and make sneakout more difficult. Political effects of the deal would undermine Iranian bomb advocates, reduce the chance of an Iranian decision to build the bomb. The credible alternatives—a return to sanctions or military strikes—pose significantly higher risks to US and world security. The deal is highly imperfect—but better [than] the other options realistically available."∂ Dan Joyner, University of Alabama School of Law professor, author of International Law and the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction, and contributor to ArmsControlLaw.com: "Overall I think the framework of agreement is a very good one. Iran definitely made some very significant concessions. In fact, one might be forgiven for thinking that, with all of the specificity placed on Iranian concessions, and really only fairly vague wording on the lifting of unilateral and multilateral sanctions (i.e., regarding timing) in the joint statement, Iran showed the most diplomatic courage in agreeing to this framework. I'm sure there is much that was agreed to that we don't know about, and I have no doubt that [Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad] Zarif and his team reached a satisfactory understanding with their negotiating partners on the sanctions question from their perspective. But I suppose I just wanted to highlight that Iran is the party that made the most obvious significant concessions in this framework agreement."∂ Gary Samore and Olli Heinonen of Harvard's John F. Kennedy School of Government and members of a group called United Against Nuclear Iran: The New York Times reports, "Mr. Samore…said in an email that the deal was a 'very satisfactory resolution of Fordo [enrichment facility] and Arak [plutonium reactor] issues for the 15-year term' of the accord. He had more questions about operations at Natanz [enrichment facility] and said there was 'much detail to be negotiated, but I think it's enough to be called a political framework.' Mr. Heinonen, the former chief inspector of the International Atomic Energy Agency, said, 'It appears to be a fairly comprehensive deal with most important parameters.' But he cautioned that 'Iran maintains enrichment capacity which will be beyond its near-term needs.'"∂ Joseph Cirincione, president of of Ploughshares Fund, a global security foundation, and former director for nonproliferation at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace: "The agreement does three things. It blocks all of Iran's pathways to a nuclear bomb. It imposes tough inspections to catch Iran should it try to break out, sneak out, or creep out of the deal. And it keeps our coalition united to enforce the deal. Under this deal, Iran has agreed to rip out two-thirds of its centrifuges and cut its stockpile of uranium gas by 97 percent. It will not be able to make any uranium or plutonium for a bomb. Many of the restrictions in the agreement continue for 25 years and some—like the inspections and the ban on building nuclear weapons—last forever."∂ Frank von Hippel, an expert with Princeton's Science and International Security Program: According to the McClatchy Washington Bureau, "Frank von Hippel said he was surprised that Iran had accepted an enrichment level of 3.67 percent and hadn't insisted on 5 percent. 'There are still details to be filled in, but I like it a lot,' von Hippel said on the framework…'On transparency, it looks like they really are doing a lot.'"∂ As many have noted in the past day, a framework is only a framework. There are plenty of tough and complicated details to sort out. The deal may fall apart, especially with conservatives in both Washington and Tehran—and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and his crew—sniping away and looking to subvert any agreement. But as the heated debate continues, it will be important that nonproliferation experts play a critical role in the discourse. Science-based statements, not snarky sound bites, should be the weapons of choice.
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* Anthony Cordesman, the Arleigh A. Burke Chair in Strategy at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, a former national security aide to Sen. John McCain, and a former director of intelligence assessment in the Office of the Secretary of Defense
* William Burns, president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, former deputy secretary of state, and former career ambassador in the Foreign Service
* Matthew Bunn, professor at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government and coprincipal investigator at the Project on Managing the Atom
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* Joseph Cirincione, president of Ploughshares Fund, a global security foundation, and former director for nonproliferation at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
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#### Aff ev just a bunch of biased conservative misinformation – scrutinize their evidence – the deal solves.

Kaplan 15. [Fred, foreign policy journalist and author, "The Deal of a Lifetime" Slate – April 2 -- www.slate.com/articles/news\_and\_politics/war\_stories/2015/04/iranian\_nuclear\_deal\_is\_a\_breakthrough\_why\_the\_agreement\_is\_the\_best\_option.html]

The Iranian nuclear deal reached in Switzerland on Thursday is a significant breakthrough. Uncertainties remain, inherently so, as it’s merely a “political framework” for a formal deal to be completed and signed by June 30. But this framework turns out to be far more detailed, quantitative, and restrictive than anyone had expected.∂ It might not lead to a deal as good as the outline suggests; it might not lead to a deal at all. But anyone who denounces this framework—anyone who argues that we should pull out of the talks, impose more sanctions, or bomb Iran because it’s better to have no deal than to have this one—is not a serious person or is pursuing a parochial agenda.

### Impact – Iran Prolif

#### Iran deal collapse causes mass proliferation.

Borger 14. [Julian, Guardian's diplomatic editor, “A nuclear deal with Iran would mean a less volatile world” The Guardian -- December 31 -- http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/dec/31/nuclear-deal-iran-cuba-proliferation]

There will be no greater diplomatic prize in 2015 than a comprehensive nuclear deal with Iran. In its global significance, it would dwarf the US detente with Cuba, and not just because there are seven times more Iranians than Cubans. This deal will not be about cash machines in the Caribbean, but about nuclear proliferation in the most volatile region on Earth.∂ An agreement was supposed to have been reached by 24 November, but Iran and the west were too far apart to make the final leap. After nine months of bargaining, the intricate, multidimensional negotiation boiled down to two main obstacles: Iran’s long-term capacity to enrich uranium, and the speed and scale of sanctions relief.∂ Iran wants international recognition of its right not just to enrich, but to do so on an industrial scale. It wants to maintain its existing infrastructure of 10,000 centrifuges in operation and another 9,000 on standby, and it wants to be able to scale that capacity up many times.∂ The US and its allies say Tehran has no need for so much enriched uranium. Its one existing reactor is Russian-built, as are its planned reactors, so all of them come with Russian-supplied fuel as part of the contract. The fear is that industrial enrichment capacity would allow Iran to make a bomb’s-worth of weapons-grade uranium very quickly, if it decided it needed one – faster than the international community could react.∂ However, the west is currently not offering large-scale, immediate sanctions relief in return for such curbs on Iran’s activity. President Barack Obama can only temporarily suspend US congressional sanctions, and western states are prepared to reverse only some elements of UN security council sanctions. The best the west can offer upfront is a lifting of the EU oil embargo.∂ These gaps remain substantial, but none of the parties involved can walk away from the table. A collapse of talks would lead to a slide back to the edge of conflict between Iran and Israel; the latter has vowed to launch military strikes rather than allow the former to build a bomb. It could also trigger a wave of proliferation across the region and beyond as other countries hedge their bets.∂ So the parties to the talks have given themselves more time – until 1 March 2015 – to agree a framework deal for bridging them and until 1 July to work out all of the details. They have resumed meetings in Geneva, with an emphasis on sessions between the two most important countries, the US and Iran. The trouble is that, while the diplomats inside the chamber sense that they are still making progress in closing the gaps, the sceptics back home just see deceit and playing for time by the other side.∂ This is particularly true of the US Congress. A new Republican-controlled Senate will convene on 6 January. From that date, the White House can no longer rely on a Democratic majority leader to keep new sanctions legislation off the Senate floor. The legislation now under discussion could take the form of triggered sanctions, which would come into effect if there was no deal by a target date. That would add urgency to the negotiations, undoubtedly a good thing, but it would also provoke counter-measures from Iran’s parliament, the Majlis, and a very volatile environment.

#### Iran prolif causes extinction – outweighs on magnitude.

Kroenig 15. [Matthew, Associate Professor and International Relations Field Chair, Department of Government, Georgetown University and Nonresident Senior Fellow, Brent Scowcroft Center on International Security, The Atlantic Council, “The History of Proliferation Optimism: Does It Have a Future?” Journal of Strategic Studies, Volume 38, Issue 1-2, 2015, pp. 98-125, Taylor & Francis]

Nuclear War **The greatest threat posed by the spread of nuclear weapons is** nuclear war. The more states in possession of nuclear weapons, **the greater the probability that somewhere**, someday, **there will be a** catastrophic nuclear war**.** To date, nuclear weapons have only been used in warfare once. In 1945, the United States used nuclear weapons on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, bringing World War II to a close. Many analysts point to the 65-plus-year tradition of nuclear non-use as evidence that nuclear weapons are unusable, **but it would be naïve to think that nuclear weapons will never be used again** simply **because they have not been used for some time**. After all, analysts in the 1990s argued that worldwide economic downturns like the Great Depression were a thing of the past, only to be surprised by the dot-com bubble bursting later in the decade and the Great Recession of the late 2000s.48 This author, for one, would be surprised if nuclear weapons are not used again sometime in his lifetime.Before reaching a state of MAD, new nuclear states go through a transition period in which they lack a secure-second strike capability. In this context, one or both states might believe that it has an incentive to use nuclear weapons first. For example, **if Iran acquires nuclear weapons, neither Iran, nor** its nuclear-armed rival, **Israel, will have a secure, second-strike capability**. Even though it is believed to have a large arsenal, given its small size and lack of strategic depth, **Israel might not be confident that it could absorb a nuclear strike and respond with a devastating counterstrike**. Similarly, Iran might eventually be able to build a large and survivable nuclear arsenal, but, when it first crosses the nuclear threshold, Tehran will have a small and vulnerable nuclear force. In these pre-MAD situations, there are at least three ways that nuclear war could occur. First, the state with the nuclear advantage might believe it has a splendid first strike capability. In a crisis, Israel might, therefore, decide to launch a preventive nuclear strike to disarm Iran’s nuclear capabilities. Indeed, this incentive might be further increased by Israel’s aggressive strategic culture that emphasizes preemptive action. Second, the state with a small and vulnerable nuclear arsenal, in this case Iran, **might feel** use them or lose them pressures. That is, in a crisis, **Iran might decide to** strike first **rather than risk having its entire nuclear arsenal destroyed**. Third, as Thomas Schelling has argued, nuclear war could result **due to the reciprocal fear of surprise attack**.49 If there are advantages to striking first, one state might start a nuclear war in the belief that war is inevitable and that it would be better to go first than to go second. Fortunately, there is no historic evidence of this dynamic occurring in a nuclear context, but it is still possible. In an Israeli–Iranian crisis, for example, Israel and Iran might both prefer to avoid a nuclear war, but **decide to strike first rather than suffer a devastating first attack** from an opponent. Even in a world of MAD, however, when both sides have secure, second-strike capabilities, there is still a risk of nuclear war. Rational deterrence theory assumes nuclear-armed states are governed by rational leaders who would not intentionally launch a suicidal nuclear war. This assumption appears to have applied to past and current nuclear powers, but **there is no guarantee that it will continue to hold in the future**. Iran’s theocratic government, despite its inflammatory rhetoric, has followed a fairly pragmatic foreign policy since 1979, but it contains leaders who hold millenarian religious worldviews and could one day ascend to power. We cannot rule out the possibility that, as nuclear weapons continue to spread, some leader somewhere will choose to launch a nuclear war, knowing full well that it could result in self-destruction. One does not need to resort to irrationality, however, to imagine nuclear war under MAD. Nuclear weapons may deter leaders from intentionally launching full-scale wars, but they do not mean the end of international politics. As was discussed above, nuclear-armed states still have conflicts of interest and leaders still seek to coerce nuclear-armed adversaries. Leaders might, therefore, choose to launch a limited nuclear war.50 This strategy might be especially attractive to states in a position of conventional inferiority that might have an incentive to escalate a crisis quickly to the nuclear level. During the Cold War, the United States planned to use nuclear weapons first to stop a Soviet invasion of Western Europe given NATO’s conventional inferiority.51 As Russia’s conventional power has deteriorated since the end of the Cold War, Moscow has come to rely more heavily on nuclear weapons in its military doctrine. Indeed, Russian strategy calls for the use of nuclear weapons early in a conflict (something that most Western strategists would consider to be escalatory) as a way to de-escalate a crisis. Similarly, Pakistan’s military plans for nuclear use in the event of an invasion from conventionally stronger India. And finally, Chinese generals openly talk about the possibility of nuclear use against a US superpower in a possible East Asia contingency. Second, as was also discussed above, leaders can make a ‘threat that leaves something to chance’.52 They can initiate a nuclear crisis. By playing these risky games of nuclear brinkmanship, states can **increase the risk of nuclear war** in an attempt to force a less resolved adversary to back down. Historical crises have not resulted in nuclear war, but many of them, including the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, have come close. And scholars have documented historical incidents when accidents nearly led to war.53 **When we think about future nuclear crisis dyads**, such as Iran and Israel, **with fewer sources of stability than** existed during **the Cold War, we can see that there is a** real risk **that a** future crisis could result in a devastating nuclear exchange**.**
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### Yes Kirk - Momentum

#### Kirk will win gaining momentum with swing voters – tv ads, and Duckworth trial

Chicago Sun-Times 6/23/16 [Lynn Sweet; Washington Bureau Chief, Chicago Sun-Times, master's from Northwestern University's Medill School of Journalism. She received her undergraduate degree from the University of California at Berkeley; and Tina Sfondeles; 06/23/2016, 07:53pm; Kirk-Duckworth race heats up with TV ad, lawsuit development; http://chicago.suntimes.com/politics/kirk-duckworth-race-heats-up-tv-ad-lawsuit-development///TPB]

The Senate race between Sen. Mark Kirk, R-Ill., and Rep. Tammy Duckworth, D-Ill., was active on several fronts on Thursday, including Kirk launching his first paid ad since the primary and a politically troublesome lawsuit involving Duckworth possibly heading towards a settlement.¶ A centerpiece of Kirk’s re-election strategy is to promote the first-term senator as a political independent, and events have played to his favor.¶ Kirk’s new spot highlights his opposition to GOP presumptive nominee Donald Trump and Kirk being the first Republican to call for a hearing and a vote for President Barack Obama’s Supreme Court nominee Merrick Garland. Kirk’s ad even uses the stroke he suffered that kept him out of the Senate for a year while he recovered.¶ The 32-second spot, to run on Chicago broadcast and cable outlets through the end of the month, is backed with a buy of about $285,000. That contrasts with a statewide, $850,000 buy for two spots that ran in February and March attacking Duckworth as weak on national security. The Illinois primary was March 15.¶ The new Kirk spot, titled “Even More” is narrated by a woman and touches on themes that are gauged to appeal to suburban Chicago female swing voters who are prime Kirk targets.¶ The spot says “Mark was the first Republican to support a vote on President Obama’s Supreme Court nominee. He’s a leader on protecting a woman’s right to choose. And Mark Kirk bucked his party to say Donald Trump is not fit to be commander in chief.”¶ What the spot does not say – that before Kirk dumped Trump, in March Kirk said he would support him if he won the nomination.¶ The Duckworth campaign has not run paid television since the primary.¶ THE DUCKWORTH LAWSUIT¶ Another element of Kirk’s strategy has been to throw a spotlight on a civil lawsuit against Duckworth that has been percolating for years, relating to her tenure as the director of the Illinois Department of Veterans Affairs. She was appointed to the job by then Gov. Rod Blagojevich, now serving a 14-year federal prison sentence following convictions on corruption charges.¶ Kirk and his allies have been trying to impugn Duckworth through her association with Blagojevich.¶ The Kirk camp has been emphasizing the potential that Duckworth may have to testify in the Downstate Union County case, with a trial set for Aug. 15. The Kirk campaign even sent out “save the date” postcards with the message, “Tammy Duckworth VS. IDVA Whistleblowers.”¶ In a new development, a pretrial settlement conference was set for Friday – and the Kirk campaign seized on that, saying in a release on Thursday that “Duckworth is now having a change of heart as her taxpayer-funded legal team is engaged in closed-door talks to settle her case.”

### Yes Kirk - Corruption

#### Kirk will win – Duckworth is tied to Chicago corruption and economic woes – empirically caused a Republican governor – assumes counter-warrants

Byrne 6/26/16 [Dennis Byrne; bachelor of arts degree in journalism and political science from Marquette University, a masters degree in urban affairs from University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee and was a Russell Sage Post-Graduate Fellow in Social Science Writing at the University of Wisconsin, Madison June 26, 2016 at 1:19 pm; Is Tammy Duckworth a sure bet to beat Mark Kirk for Illinois' Senate seat?; http://www.chicagonow.com/dennis-byrnes-barbershop/2016/06/is-tammy-duckworth-a-sure-bet-to-beat-mark-kirk-for-illinois-senate-seat///TPB]

Distant newsrooms have sent word to Chicago that Republican moderate Mark Kirk is dead meat in his bid to win a second term as Illinois’s junior senator. He reliably tops newspaper lists of "Most Endangered GOP Senators in 2016."¶ The conventional wisdom is that, with Trump at the top of the ticket, Kirk will be one of many down-ballot Republicans sunk by the Donald. Thus do the Democrats win the Senate.¶ Not so fast.¶ At least in Illinois the question will be whom voters loathe less: the admittedly dreadful Trump or the assorted chiselers, payrollers, bounders, grifters, and ganefs who have run Illinois into the ground. The assorted so-and-sos being allies of Kirk's rival, Rep. Tammy Duckworth.¶ Illinois may be the single most corrupt and financially crippled state in the union. Could it be that Illinois voters will finally get fed up with disastrous Democratic rule? And might that anger spill over onto Duckworth?¶ Two years ago Illinois voters were so sick of the corruption and mismanagement that they elected a Republican governor, Bruce Rauner, who ran on a confrontational, reformist platform. Since then, Illinois has spiraled even deeper into political, economic, and social chaos. Rauner's reforms have been stymied by the speaker of the Illinois house of representatives, Michael Madigan, who's known not only for his support of organized labor, but for his skill in arranging property tax breaks for pals and campaign donors. The toll: two years without a state budget; pension debts of more than $100 billion and counting; billions in unpaid bills; a Chicago school system near bankruptcy; Chicago itself not far behind; higher taxes; crippled services; residents and businesses jumping ship; murderous gang warfare in Chicago neighborhoods.¶ Can Duckworth avoid getting tarred with these troubles? To keep clear of the wreckage she'll have to distance herself from Chicago mayor Rahm Emanuel. Which may be hard, given that his support is how she got her start.¶ Before he became mayor, before he served as Barack Obama's chief of staff, Emanuel was an ambitious congressman and chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee. He spotted Duckworth as an appealing candidate—an Iraq war veteran who, while copiloting a Black Hawk helicopter, lost both her legs in combat. Emanuel pushed her to run for the U.S. House seat representing the conservative west Chicago suburbs. She came close to winning, losing that 2006 election by only a few thousand votes.¶ But in Illinois, losers don't fade away—they get jobs. Just weeks after the election, then-governor Rod Blagojevich appointed her director of the Illinois Department of Veterans' Affairs. Loyalty being the coin of the realm in Illinois politics, Duckworth returned the favor by endorsing the discredited and clownish Blagojevich's reelection bid even after his corruption had been exposed. He eventually was convicted for trying to sell the Senate seat vacated by president-elect Barack Obama.¶ Obama would find Duckworth a job in his Department of Veterans Affairs as assistant secretary for public and intergovernmental affairs. In other words, she was responsible for looking after the reputation of the department, a job that wasn't what one would call a screaming success. After a few years in Washington, she came back to Illinois to make another go at a congressional seat—this time, in a district favorable to Democrats, she won.¶ It's quite a résumé: protégée of Rahm Emanuel; associate of Rod Blagojevich; official in the most disdained and dysfunctional department in the federal government. And she's supposed to challenge Illinois's dismal status quo?¶ Since he was first elected to the House in 2000, from a wealthy north suburban district noted for its limousine-liberal electorate, Kirk has worked to position himself as an independent in the mode of former Republican senator Charles Percy. A swing-district moderate who succeeded in winning, in 2010, a blue-state Senate seat, Kirk has been branded a RINO by hardline conservatives.¶ Duckworth's strategy is to paint and taint Kirk as a Trump supporter. Kirk was an early critic of Trump, both for the businessman's preposterous immigration policies and for his ridicule of Sen. John McCain's years as a POW. But Kirk had fallen in line after Trump secured the nomination. Then the presumptive GOP nominee accused the judge overseeing the Trump University class action lawsuit of bias because the judge is of Mexican descent. Duckworth blasted Kirk for not denouncing the billionaire and Kirk quickly reversed course, withdrawing his earlier backing for Trump. "I cannot and will not support my party's nominee for president," Kirk announced, "regardless of the political impact on my candidacy or the Republican Party."¶ Cynics will regard Kirk's reversal as a craven political move, necessitated by his supposedly dismal prospects. But according to Kirk's campaign manager, Kevin Artl, internal polling shows the race is neck and neck. Kirk has the advantage of speaking Spanish and polls better among Hispanics; Duckworth does better among African Americans. Artl notes that Kirk has always run as an underdog and has yet to lose an election.

### Yes Kirk – A2: Trial Settled

#### Kirk will win- trial being settled doesn’t stop his message connecting her to Chicago corruption over it

Politico 6/27/16 [Elena Schneider; Master’s and a Bachelor’s in Journalism from Northwestern University’s Medill School of Journalism; On deck: Colorado, New York, Oklahoma, Utah go to the polls Tuesday; 06/27/16 10:00 AM EDT; http://www.politico.com/tipsheets/morning-score/2016/06/on-deck-colorado-new-york-oklahoma-utah-go-to-the-polls-tuesday-215026#ixzz4CsmZMdtx//TPB]

COURT DRAMA — Duckworth settles lawsuit: A lawsuit against Senate candidate Tammy Duckworth settled Friday, a setback for opponent Sen. Mark Kirk, whose campaign has frequently used the case as fodder for attacks on Duckworth. The lawsuit, which alleged Duckworth retaliated inappropriately against two employees while at the Illinois Department of Veterans Affairs, settled for $26,000. There was no finding of wrongdoing, The Chicago Tribune reports. The case was set to go to trial in August, which would have allowed the Kirk campaign to extract maximum political mileage. In a statement, Duckworth spokesman Matt McGrath said that the settlement was “appropriate for what was always a frivolous workplace case.” But the Kirk campaign is keeping the heat on. Campaign spokesman Kevin Artl kept the heat on in a statement Friday, saying that “the simple truth is that if Tammy Duckworth was innocent, she would not have settled this case… Duckworth has chosen to stay silent and settle the case at taxpayer expense in order to hide from the truth. Duckworth's actions have cost Illinois taxpayers tens of thousands of dollars while prolonging the legacy of Rod Blagojevich corruption."

### Yes Kirk – Laundry List + A2: Funding

#### Kirk will win, funding is a short-term situation, Duckworth’s ethics trial will collapse her campaign

Hinz 6/3/16 [GREG HINZ; Writer for Crain’s Chicago Business; Northwestern University’s Medill School of Journalism; Big money skipping Kirk-Duckworth race—so far; June 03, 2016; http://www.chicagobusiness.com/article/20160603/BLOGS02/160609921/big-money-skipping-kirk-duckworth-race-so-far//TPB]

While voters in some states already are being bombarded with TV ads aimed at retaining or dumping their GOP U.S. senator, Illinois' contest between incumbent Mark Kirk and Democratic challenger Tammy Duckworth has pretty much disappeared from sight since the March primaries.¶ Is that a sign that smart Republican money thinks Kirk will be hard to save in blue-state Illinois? Or is something else afoot?¶ A piece in Real Clear Politics today leans toward the former.¶ The article notes that while mega-millions already have been dropped in Ohio, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania and neighboring Wisconsin, just $1.1 million has been spent by the two sides and outside groups here, with organizations such as the right-leaning Club for Growth deciding to pass on Illinois.¶ Team Kirk rejects the spin that Republican donors are staying away. It notes that, unlike the states mentioned above, Illinois is not considered even potentially in play in the presidential contest and says polls show Kirk and Duckworth pretty close to each other.¶ For the record, the Kirk forces are trying to turn this to their advantage. Says spokeswoman Eleni Demertzis, "Given that the race is tied and that news coverage about Rep. Duckworth's upcoming trial on ethics violations has blanketed the airwaves, it comes as no surprise that Democrat groups are hesitant to spend while Republican groups will allow the self-inflicted collapse of one of the DSCC's top recruits to continue unabated."¶ Of course, the Duckworth folks say the trial, which involves allegations by a whistleblower involving Duckworth's time as head of the state's Department of Veterans Affairs, will melt away to nothing in the summer sun.¶ My hunch is that there's something to the theory that the money guys are worried about Kirk, especially if Donald Trump's campaign melts down. There simply will be higher-priority needs elsewhere.¶ But, if this race stays close into, say, late September, stay away from your TV set, because there will be nastiness, and lots of it. Until March or so, Illinois was home to one of the most expensive Senate races in the country. It could be again.

#### Kirk has momentum, funding is flipped, Trump attacks aren’t working, pushing in on ethics trial

NBC Chicago 6/10/16 [Tom Schuba; Jun 10, 2016; Kirk Uses 'Save the Date' Mailer to Remind Voters About Duckworth Trial; http://www.nbcchicago.com/blogs/ward-room/Kirk-Uses-Save-the-Date-Mailer-to-Remind-Voters-About-Duckworth-Trial-382502611.html//TPB]

Sen. Mark Kirk’s campaign sent out a mailer this week with a “save the date” for Rep. Tammy Duckworth’s upcoming workplace retaliation trial. ¶ The mailer comes amid a fierce battle between the two as Kirk faces a tough bid for re-election against Duckworth in November.¶ The 7-year-old lawsuit against Duckworth, which will go to trial on August 15, alleges ethics violations and workplace retaliation during the her time as Director of the Illinois Department of Veterans Affairs, although the congresswoman denies treating the employees unfairly.¶ According to the lawsuit, Christine Butler accuses Duckworth of firing her for insubordination for complaints she made against her boss, the facility's director. The termination was ultimately reversed within days of the meeting with Duckworth.¶ Duckworth Launches 'Who Said It?' Featuring Kirk, Trump¶ Denise Goins claims that her complaints about the same supervisor led to an unfavorable performance review after initially being ignored. Goins claims the performance review prevented her from receiving a raise. In addition to this, she claims Duckworth told her to "do your job and keep your mouth shut" during a meeting.¶ Butler and Goins are seeking compensatory damages of at least $50,000, as well as other financial penalties.¶ Duckworth Slams Kirk for Failing to Comment on Trump’s Judge Attacks¶ Kirk’s campaign has hammered Duckworth on the lawsuit and her ties to incarcerated former Illinois Gov. Rod Blagojevich, who appointed the congresswoman Director of the IDVA in 2006.¶ Duckworth's campaign responded to the mailer Friday, claiming Kirk should be worried about the Nov. 8 election, not Duckworth's trial date. The congresswoman's camp also faulted Kirk for his campaign funding.¶ Kirk 'Cannot and Will Not' Support Trump as GOP Nominee¶ “The date Republican Mark Kirk should be worried about is November 8, 2016, when Illinois voters will have an opportunity to pass judgment on his six years of ineffectiveness," Democratic Party of Illinois spokesman Sean Savett said in a statement. "On second thought, Kirk has been effective at doing the bidding of the Wall Street banks and Washington lobbyists that fund his campaigns at the expense of Illinois working families."¶ "That's what's going to matter this election no matter how much Mark Kirk continues to exaggerate and peddle fiction," Savett added.¶ Who Will Senator Kirk Back for President?¶ According to Open Secrets, Kirk has accepted over $3 million from the securities and investment industry since 2002, making the industry his top donor. ¶ Meanwhile, Duckworth’s campaign has tried to tie the senator to presumptive Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump. In March, Kirk told NBC Chicago that he would support Trump if he were the Republican presidential nominee.¶ Kirk changed course this week, condemning the divisive billionaire and pulling his support.¶ The senator’s announcement was made on the heels of Trump’s statements about the heritage of a Hispanic judge presiding over civil fraud lawsuits against his beleaguered Trump University. In his statement, Kirk called the comments “un-American.”¶ “As the Presidential campaign progressed, I was hoping the rhetoric would tone down and reflect a campaign that was inclusive, thoughtful and principled,” Kirk said in a statement Tuesday. “While I oppose the Democratic nominee, Donald Trump's latest statements, in context with past attacks on Hispanics, women and the disabled like me, make it certain that I cannot and will not support my party's nominee for President regardless of the political impact on my candidacy or the Republican Party.”¶ Nevertheless, the Duckworth campaign continued the assault Wednesday, releasing a campaign video featuring incendiary statements made by Trump before Kirk pulled his support.¶ “While Trump has long demonstrated that he lacks the judgment, temperament, or even the values to be President of the United States, Kirk not only chose to endorse him, he looked forward to Trump being a ‘net benefit’ to his campaign,” Duckworth spokesman Matt McGrath said in a statement. “Now that Trump’s increasingly unhinged campaign looks like an anchor instead of a blessing, Kirk is moving on.”¶ In response, the Kirk campaign slammed the video for its "demonstrably false claim" and continued to tie Duckworth to Blagojevich.¶ "Ironically, Trump and Duckworth have much more in common than people think," Kirk spokesman Kevin Artl said in a statement Thursday. "Both supported corrupt former Illinois Governor Rod Blagojevich and both are headed to trial."

## \*\*\*Link

### Link Turn – Independents

#### Even though independents may be concerned about China, they still like foreign trade overwhelming

Friedman 12 Uri Friedman, writer for Foreign Policy, 2012 (“What is the foreign policy of independent voters” <http://foreignpolicy.com/2012/10/16/whats-the-foreign-policy-of-independent-voters/> October 16th ) WP

Here’s a quick look at the ways self-identified independents responded to the organization’s questions: Nearly 60 percent believe the United States is headed down the wrong track¶ 49 percent say the economy is their top voting concern; only 5 percent say national security is¶ Roughly 18 percent identify terrorists as the biggest threat to American national security interests, making it the most popular choice among the group, and 43 percent think the threat of terrorism on American soil has increased since 9/11 ¶ 48 percent cite Iran as the country that poses the most danger to American national security interests¶ Roughly 57 percent favor preventing Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons even if that means taking U.S. military action against Tehran — placing independents between Democrats (49 percent) and Republicans (79 percent) ¶ Independents are pretty much evenly split on whether the United States should maintain its troop presence in Afghanistan to prevent the country from becoming a safe haven for terrorists or withdraw U.S. forces regardless of whether Afghan security forces are prepared to security the country; Republicans favor keeping troops in the country while Democrats favor withdrawal¶ Around 65 percent feel the United States should work with its allies to establish a no-fly zone in Syria¶ 50 percent think we’re spending the right amount of money on national defense, putting independents at odds with Democrats (who are more likely to support reductions) and Republicans (who are more likely to support increases)¶ Nearly 60 percent believe foreign aid is a waste, again placing independents between Democrats (42 percent) and Republicans (63 percent), but nearly three out of four would support foreign assistance if there was a system to ensure that the aid was used effectively¶ More than 50 percent have an unfavorable view of China and just under 50 percent have an unfavorable view of Russia; more than 60 percent have an unfavorable view of Egypt¶ 72 percent have a favorable view of Israel¶ 64 percent think trade between the United States and foreign countries is a good thing¶ Roughly 87 percent believe America is a force for good in the world and more than 90 percent say it is important for the United States to play a significant role in world affairs¶ Independents, of course, are not necessarily synonymous with undecided voters (according to the FPI poll, more than 40 percent of independents report that they’re either voting for Obama or leaning toward doing so, and just under 40 percent say the same about Romney).But if you track another, significantly smaller group in the survey — those who identify as "firm undecideds" when it comes to the election — on the issues listed above, you’ll find the same broad trends. The portrait of the independent voter that emerges — focused primarily on the economy, wary of tinkering with defense spending, relatively hawkish on Iran and Syria, concerned about the rise of China, ambivalent on Afghanistan, skeptical of foreign aid, pessimistic about the direction of the country but bullish on America’s global leadership — is worth keeping in mind as you watch tonight’s debate.

### Link Turn – Public Support

#### Plan is popular – public has consistently seen China as a beneficial trade ally for 10 years

Friedhoff and Smeltz 15 Karl Friedhoff, Fellow, Public Opinion and Foreign Policy; [Dina Smeltz](https://www.thechicagocouncil.org/publication/americans-view-relations-china-important-despite-some-mistrust#tablist1-tab1), Senior Fellow, Public Opinion and Foreign Policy, 2016, (AMERICANS VIEW RELATIONS WITH CHINA AS IMPORTANT DESPITE SOME MISTRUST, September 22nd, <https://www.thechicagocouncil.org/publication/americans-view-relations-china-important-despite-some-mistrust>, 6.22.16, WP

Despite suspicions toward China, the American public prefers engagement to the containment of China. In the 2014 Chicago Council Survey, 67 percent of Americans said the United States should undertake friendly cooperation and engagement with China. Three in ten (29%) said that the United States should seek to actively limit China’s growth. This finding has been consistent since the question was first asked in 2006. Americans underscore the importance of ties to China likely because of growing Chinese influence in Asia. Fifty-two percent expect that China’s influence in Asia will grow in the next ten years, compared to just 31 percent who expect the same from the United States. [2] Some expectation of China’s influence in the next decade, however, is based on misperception. From 2010 through 2014, Pew Research surveys showed that Americans were either as likely or more likely to name China as to name the United States when asked which country is the world’s leading economic power. In the most recent spring 2015 survey, however, Americans were more likely to say that the United States leads by ten percentage points (46% US, 36% China), perhaps a reflection of China’s economic difficulties over the past several months as well as US economic recovery.

#### Public supports the plan – fears full military confrontation

Lumbers 15 (Michael, PhD, heads the Emerging Security Program at the NATO Association of Canada and serves as a senior analyst for the Asia Pacific Desk at Wikistrat, “Whither the Pivot? Alternative U.S. Strategies for Responding to China's Rise” *Comparative Strategy*, 34(4), 311-329)

Short of such a shock, it is exceedingly difficult to envision such a radical departure in strategy garnering support at home or among regional allies. Generally, recent public opinion surveys have revealed that while Americans are uneasy about China’s rise, they are roughly divided when asked whether the United States should adopt a tougher economic posture toward China, while strong majorities are opposed to a military confrontation. When asked whether the U.S. should engage with China or work to limit its rise, roughly two-thirds have consistently opted for the former approach.10 The marked decline in enthusiasm for U.S. activism abroad after a decade of entanglement in the Middle East and in the wake of a financial crisis has surely only cemented this sentiment.11 Circumstances, of course, could change. For the foreseeable future, however, popular support for a strategy of confrontation would only result from a direct, unprecedented Chinese threat to U.S. security.

**Link Turn – Competition**

#### Broad data research found that many counties increase in congressional democrat votes after permanent normal trade relations with China.

**Che et al 16** Yi Che, Yi Lu, Justin R. Pierce, Peter K. Schott, Zhigang Tao, writers at National Bureau of Economic Research, 2016, (DOES TRADE LIBERALIZATION WITH CHINA INFLUENCE U.S. ELECTIONS?, April, <http://www.nber.org/papers/w22178.pdf>, 6/22/16. WP

We find that U.S. counties more exposed to increased competition from China experience increases in the share of voters cast for Democrats in Congressional elections, along with increases in the probability that a Democrat represents a county and the probability of a county switching from a Republican to a Democrat Representative. The results are also economically significant we find that moving a county from the 25th to the 75th percentile of exposure to China increases the Democrat vote share in Congressional elections by 1.5 percentage points, or a 3.7 percent increase relative to the average share of voter won by Democrats in the 2000 Congressional election. Moreover, we find that the effect of the increase in import competition on voting is slightly larger once we account for the exposure of other counties in the same labor market, and that increased import competition is associated with higher voter turnout and a higher share of votes cast for Democrats in Presidential and gubernatorial elections. The second half of our analysis investigates potential links between these voting outcomes and the policy choices of legislators in Congress. We use a regression discontinuity approach to examine differences between Democrats and Republicans voting on hills related to trade and economic assistance programs. We find that Democrats are more likely to support policies that limit import competition and that provide economic assistance that may benefit workers adversely affected by trade competition, providing an explanation for the voting behavior documented in the first part of our paper.

**China Not Key**

#### China policy irrelevant – no one cares, including prez candidates

Carpenter 15 (Ted Galen, senior fellow for defense and foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute and is the author of nine books in addition to more than 550 articles and policy studies on international issues, 8/31, "China: The Mishandled Issue in the U.S. Presidential Election Campaign," http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/china-mishandled-issue-us-presidential-election-campaign)

U.S. presidential election campaigns are supposed to include sober discussions of the most crucial issues facing the country. Unfortunately, the reality rarely corresponds to that ideal, and the current conduct of candidates seeking their party’s nomination for the 2016 election is no exception. One issue that should be front and center in the campaign is U.S. policy toward China. Instead, that topic receives surprisingly little attention—especially compared to the obsession over every aspect of Middle East policy. When it is not ignored, candidates too often take shrill positions merely to score cheap political points with disgruntled constituencies. Given the great importance of the bilateral relationship, such posturing is unfortunate and could become dangerous. The lack of attention to China policy was evident in the first debate among the 10 leading GOP candidates. Most of them did not even mention the country, and those who did clearly adopted a hostile attitude. Donald Trump scorned U.S. leaders for not being better negotiators in their dealings with Beijing. Senator Rand Paul mentioned that China holds an enormous amount of U.S. governmental debt, making it clear that he believed such dependence was unhealthy and a national vulnerability. A few of the other candidates on the stage implied that China was among the “enemies” that supposedly no longer respected the United States because of Barack Obama’s lack of effective leadership. That behavior has been typical of the campaign thus far. Carly Fiorina, the fastest rising star in the Republican field, has devoted time to discussing China, but Chinese leaders almost certainly do not welcome the attention. Both in the debate and on other occasions, Fiorina has taken an extremely confrontational stance regarding such issues as the South China Sea territorial disputes and cyber security. In an interview with CBS News, she recommended that the United States increase its flyover aerial surveillance of the South China Sea. And it is clear that she has no sympathy for Beijing’s territorial claims. “We cannot permit China to control a trade route through which passes $5 trillion worth of goods and services every year,” she stated bluntly. Fiorina was mild on the South China Sea controversy compared to her stance regarding recent cyber attacks—which she blithely assumed originated in China. She contended that such attacks were an act of aggression against the United States, implying that an especially stern, confrontational response was warranted. Wisconsin Governor Scott Walker, another top tier GOP candidate, has likewise adopted a hardline policy toward China. In a July interview with The National Interest, Walker accused Beijing of mounting a “serious challenge to American interests.” He stated that Washington needed to beef-up U.S. military capabilities in East Asia, strengthen its alliances with Beijing’s neighbors, and develop a robust cyber capability “that punishes China for its hacking.” And as if those positions would not be enough to poison the bilateral relationship, Walker stressed that the United States needed to “speak out against the abysmal lack of freedoms in China.” On the Democratic campaign trail, Hillary Clinton has not said much about policy toward China. But there is little doubt about her attitude. As Secretary of State, Clinton noticeably toughened the U.S. position on the South China Sea issue. It was Clinton who made the speech to ASEAN in 2010 that underscored Washington’s hostility to Beijing’s territorial claims. And she went out of her way on other occasions to emphasize U.S. solidarity with the Philippines regarding its territorial spat with China. Clinton’s few comments on China policy during the current campaign offer no hint of a softening of such positions.

**Econ Key**

#### Econ outweighs all other issues.

Lizza 16. [Ryan, "Eight Questions for the New Year in Politics" The New Yorker – Jan 1 -- www.newyorker.com/news/daily-comment/eight-questions-for-the-new-year-in-politics]

7. Will Barack Obama help or hurt the Democratic nominee? The single most important factor in next year’s election will be the state of the economy. If the economy is continuing to improve and growth is strong and unemployment low, the Democrats will have a modest edge. But dragging them down will be the natural exhaustion the electorate generally feels after eight years of seeing the same party in power. Obama’s own popularity is closely tied to the economy, but he can help the Democrat nominee by making steady progress on a popular domestic agenda, combatting ISIS, and proving that his more unpopular policies (like the Affordable Care Act) are working and that his legacy initiatives should be continued and improved upon, as Clinton promises, rather than overturned, as the G.O.P. promises.

#### State of the economy determines the election – also its too far away for predictions.

**Pitney 14.** [Jack, Decoder contributor, "Election 2016: why today's confident predictions could look silly in two years" Christian Science Monitor -- www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/Politics-Voices/2014/1114/Election-2016-why-today-s-confident-predictions-could-look-silly-in-two-years]

Usually, **the most powerful influence on elections is the state of the economy**. If average voters feel more money in their pockets, then the incumbent party should do well. If they are getting worse off, then they will throw the bums out. In this year’s election, gross domestic product was rising and unemployment was falling, but stagnant wages contributed to the sense that the economy was still in the doldrums.∂ So what kind of economy will voters see in 2016? Maybe prosperity lurks just around the corner. Maybe the sluggish expansion will curdle into a toxic recession. Nobody can say. Not even the most sophisticated economic models can reliably forecast the global economy two years in advance.

#### Econ is key

Long 5-26-16. [Heather, CNNMoney's senior markets and economy writer, "Clinton predicted to beat Trump...due to economics" CNN Money -- money.cnn.com/2016/05/26/news/economy/hillary-clinton-beat-donald-trump-moodys/]

The reason a Democrat will win isn't about polling or personalities, it's about economics, says Moody's. The economy is the top issue in just about every election. When the economy is doing well, the party currently in office usually wins again. When the economy is tanking, Americans vote for change. So far, the U.S. economy is chugging along. It's growing. Millions of people are getting jobs, home prices are rising and gas is cheap. All of this favors Democrats.

**Single Issues Not Key**

#### Single issues can’t change votes – opinions are crystallized.

**Sabato 3-26**. [Larry, UVA Center for Politics Director, "Why htis scandal won't hurt Hillary" Sabato's Crystal Ball -- www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/]

Nevertheless, there is good reason to think that scandal has a much less pronounced effect at the presidential level. For one thing, most elections for the White House revolve around macro-issues such as the economy and war, and voters instinctively realize that personal peccadilloes fade in importance. For another, most top-tier contenders are reasonably well known and have been vetted to some degree by the press and opponents in prior elections. When voters already have a clearly formed view of a candidate and his or her strengths and weaknesses, it naturally becomes more difficult to alter impressions.∂ For no one is this more true than Hillary Clinton, who has been in the national spotlight, center stage, for 23 years. HuffPost Pollster data show over 90% of the public has already formed an opinion of Clinton, the most of any potential 2016 candidate. Other than the very youngest voters, is there really anyone left who doesn’t have a mostly fixed view of her?∂ You can argue that, to a lesser degree, the same is true for Jeb Bush. Americans outside of Florida may not know Jeb well, but they are very familiar with the Bush family. While Jeb doesn’t like it and is already struggling against it, voters attribute many of his family’s traits to him.∂ Jeb is insisting he’s his own man, yet it will be nearly impossible to insulate him from the deep recessions and Middle East wars of his father and brother. With the good that derives directly from being a Bush (instant name recognition, establishment support, tons of campaign cash) comes the unavoidable bad of the Iraq War, the response to Hurricane Katrina, and economic near-collapse.∂ Think of it this way: Both Clinton and Bush enter the campaign cycle with a million pixel image in the voters’ minds. If you add a couple thousand new pixels to the picture, the overall image doesn’t change much. A garden-variety scandal — and maybe an entire campaign full of them — won’t transform the projection on the screen.

#### Single issues aren't key to the election

Stokes 16. [Bruce, director of global economic attitudes at Pew Research Center, "How A Terror Attack Could Affect US Polls" Outlook – March 22 -- http://www.outlookindia.com/website/story/how-a-terror-attack-could-affect-us-polls/296758]

US presidential elections are decided on a number of issues, often the state of the economy. But this year, a number of international concerns about negative consequences of globalization including trade, immigration and terrorism are prominent in the political debate. History suggests that the US election will not turn on any of these issues alone, but they may well influence the outcome. And it is people outside the United States who then must also deal with the consequences.

## \*\*Impact

**No Impact: Deal Doesn’t Solve**

#### Deal doesn’t get rid of Iran’s nuclear program – only delays it.

Marcus 15. [Jonathan, BBC diplomatic correspondent, "Iran nuclear deal: Time to celebrate a breakthrough?" BBC – 4-2 -- www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-32172256]

This, it must be stressed, is not yet a complete deal. Difficult weeks of detailed drafting lie ahead. But it's a framework on which all parties are agreed. That in itself is an important outcome. Yet this is not a moment for euphoria.∂ Nobody should be under any illusions that Iran has significantly changed its attitude towards its nuclear programme or its longer-term nuclear ambitions.∂ Crisis delayed?∂ This agreement, if codified and implemented in full, will constrain Iran's nuclear programme for some 10 to 15 years. It appears to contain some new and important verification provisions to allow international inspectors greater oversight of what Iran is actually doing.∂ But the agreement falls far short of the initial western goal of rolling back Iran's nuclear programme. This may be a question of a crisis delayed rather than averted. What it does is buy time - during which a lot can happen.∂ If all goes well, the nuclear deal will reduce a key source of friction between Iran and the West.∂ World representatives at the end of talks in Switzerland∂ A deal seems to have suited all sides∂ There will still be many other areas of disagreement. Indeed, Iran remains the rising regional power and its influence in many Arab capitals ranging from Damascus and Baghdad to Beirut and Sana - let alone its human rights record and alleged support for terrorism - all suggest many other avenues for continuing tensions with Washington.∂ Negotiations have not been easy and they will only get harder. But a deal seems to have suited all sides.∂ Iran gets vital sanctions relief. Tehran's critics get significant constraints on its nuclear activities. And with so much else going on in this crisis-ridden region - the struggle against Islamic State in which the US and Iran are objectively on the same side and the fighting in Yemen where they are clearly not - means that taking the nuclear problem off the chess-board for a period of time is probably a helpful development.∂ Impressive detail∂ What was expected from these talks was a fairly bland announcement that a framework agreement had been reached. In contrast the US State Department has been quick to publish a lengthy list of what it calls the "Parameters for a Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action" regarding Iran's nuclear programme.∂ They make interesting reading and represent a clear effort to sell the deal to a sceptical Congress. Too much detail though may make it harder for Iranian diplomats to sell the deal at home in the face of scepticism from political hard-liners. On the face of it Iran has made some significant concessions.∂ Iran will be allowed to have some 6,104 centrifuges installed out of its current 19,000 and only a little over 5,000 of them will actually be enriching uranium. All the working centrifuges are to be early, less advanced models. And everything else is to be stored under supervision of IAEA inspectors∂ Iran will reduce its stockpile of low-enriched uranium - the vital feedstock that would be needed to enrich further to get bomb-making material∂ There will be no enrichment at the underground Fordow site for some 15 years∂ Inspectors will have access not just to key nuclear facilities but to the supply chain supporting Iran's nuclear programme and to uranium mines and mills∂ Iran will be required to grant access to IAEA inspectors to investigate suspicious sites or suspected clandestine activities anywhere in the country∂ The heavy water reactor at Arak that many feared would provide Iran with a plutonium route to a potential bomb is to be re-built so as not to produce weapons grade plutonium.∂ Many of these constraints will be in place for 10 years and some will last for 15.∂ In return∂ Iran will see US and EU nuclear-related sanctions suspended, though no clear timetable has been given for exactly how this will proceed∂ It will not actually have to close any nuclear facility altogether∂ It emerges, once the restrictions expire, with the basis for a significant nuclear industry.∂ Nonetheless, the level of detail is impressive and appears to have convinced nuclear experts that it does indeed provide the year-long warning of a potential Iranian break-out that has been the diplomats' goal. That is seen as sufficient time for any Iranian effort to throw aside the deal and push towards enriching sufficient material for a bomb to be quickly spotted and action taken.∂ File photo of heavy water plant at Arak, Iran, 2006∂ A heavy water reactor at Arak is to be rebuilt, according to details published by the US∂ Strong verification provisions, along with continued intelligence efforts should also be sufficient to prevent an Iranian "sneak-out" - a clandestine effort to do the same thing.∂ This may not convince many of the critics. An Israeli government spokesman described any agreement stemming from this framework as "a historic mistake". Huge questions remain. How will any Iranian infringements be responded to? Can sanctions once suspended really be re-imposed? And what level of transgression is required to provoke this?∂ But if it all works then Iran too only gains. It retains a significant nuclear infrastructure which it can expand once the agreement expires. And it gets vital relief from sanctions that have crippled its economy.∂ For now this could be a diplomatic win-win. But it is not a resolution to the fundamental questions posed by Iran's nuclear programme which relate as much to its foreign policy and military ambitions as to its proclaimed desire for nuclear power.

**AT: Iran War**

#### Iran nuclear capability doesn’t constitute a threat- only a well developed arsenal would

Hymans 14 (Jacques EC., Associate Professor, School of International Relations. University of Southern California. "No cause for panic: Key lessons from the political science literature on nuclear proliferation." International Journal: Canada's Journal of Global Policy Analysis 69.1 (2014): 85-93., TF)

Third, keep clearly in mind the crucial difference between a so-called ‘‘nuclear breakout capacity’’ and an actual nuclear weapons arsenal. The former may be a worry, but only the latter is a threat—and, for political and technical reasons, it is very hard for most states to jump suddenly from a notional breakout ‘‘capacity’’ to an actual breakout. This point is particularly relevant to the current debate over what to do about Iran’s problematic nuclear program.28 There is a crucial difference between setting a red line of ‘‘no Iranian nuclear weapon,’’ which has been done by US president Barack Obama, and setting a red line of ‘‘no Iranian nuclear weapons capability,’’ which has been done by Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu. The Netanyahu stance assumes that the acquisition of a certain number of kilograms of highly enriched uranium is essentially equivalent to a bomb, since the engineers tell us that an explosive nuclear test is not strictly tech- nically necessary in order to obtain a workable nuclear weapon. Netanyahu is therefore worried that Iran could break out of the NPT and build a bomb without anyone knowing. The Netanyahu point of view is supported by the historical case of Israel itself, which built an operational nuclear arsenal in secret without con- ducting a nuclear test.29 But a political science analysis supports Obama’s position over Netanyahu’s in the case of Iran. Not only is the typical global historical pattern to test first and induct second, but also Iran and Israel are very dissimilar cases, with different external and internal political challenges. The key factors that led Israel to produce its unique arsenal of untested but fully operational nuclear bombs are not present in the case of Iran. In addition, Iran’s empirical record of ballistic missile testing behaviour provides yet more evidence against the idea that Iran may be gravitating toward the Israeli model.30 Since the present Iranian nuclear capability cannot be legitimately seen as equivalent to an Iranian nuclear threat, the USA and its allies should reject calls for ‘‘pre-emptive’’ strikes in this case. The world still has substantial time to work out a diplomatic solution to the long-running Iranian nuclear crisis.¶ In conclusion, nuclear proliferation is a serious issue for the international com- munity, but there is no cause for panic. Moreover, unjustified and exaggerated fears of the proliferation threat lead to bad policy, as demonstrated by the unneces- sary and tragic Iraq war.31 If we can right-size our perception of the threat, we will have much more success in achieving the non-proliferation results we want, at a price we can afford.

**AT: Iran Proliferation Impact**

#### Deal can’t solve prolif

**CNN, 11-11**-2013 <http://www.cnn.com/2013/11/11/opinion/frum-iran-deal/>

1) Iran remains intensely committed to achieving a nuclear weapon.¶ Iran's new president, Hassan Rouhani, promised his countrymen relief from international sanctions. Since coming into office this summer, he has made various conciliatory noises. Was he readying Iran for a real deal?¶ Iran's red line at Geneva, the thing it would not trade away, was a capacity to continue and resume nuclear bomb development at any time. Iran's offer at Geneva amounted to a six-month delay of its nuclear program that will not in any way impair its ability to get back to bomb-making at any time.¶ Iran won't neutralize or surrender any of its fissile material; that is, material used to fuel reactors—or nuclear bombs. It won't disable any of its nuclear facilities. It will only pause. Economists use the phrase "revealed preference" to describe the way in which our actions indicate our priorities. Iran's priority remains gaining a weapon; post-Geneva, there can be no doubt about that.

#### No prolif

**Kahl, 12** (Colin H. Kahl – Associate Professor in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service and Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security, March/April, “Not Time to Attack Iran: Why War Should Be a Last Resort”, Foreign Affairs, ProQuest)

Bad timing

Kroenig argues that there is an urgent need to attack Iran's nuclear infrastructure soon, since Tehran could "produce its first nuclear weapon within six months of deciding to do so." Yet that last phrase is crucial. The International Atomic Energy Agency (iaea) has documented Iranian efforts to achieve the capacity to develop nuclear weapons at some point, but there is no hard evidence that Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei has yet made the final decision to develop them.

In arguing for a six-month horizon, Kroenig also misleadingly conflates hypothetical timelines to produce weaponsgrade uranium with the time actually required to construct a bomb. According to 2010 Senate testimony by James Cartwright, then vice chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staa, and recent statements by the former heads of Israel's national intelligence and defense intelligence agencies, even if Iran could produce enough weapons-grade uranium for a bomb in six months, it would take it at least a year to produce a testable nuclear device and considerably longer to make a deliverable weapon. And David Albright, president of the Institute for Science and International Security (and the source of Kroenig's six-month estimate), recently told Agence France-Presse that there is a "low probability" that the Iranians would actually develop a bomb over the next year even if they had the capability to do so. Because there is no evidence that Iran has built additional covert enrichment plants since the Natanz and Qom sites were outed in 2002 and 2009, respectively, any near-term move by Tehran to produce weapons-grade uranium would have to rely on its declared facilities. The iaea would thus detect such activity with su/cient time for the international community to mount a forceful response. As a result, the Iranians are unlikely to commit to building nuclear weapons until they can do so much more quickly or out of sight, which could be years oa.

Kroenig is also inconsistent about the timetable for an attack. In some places, he suggests that strikes should begin now, whereas in others, he argues that the United States should attack only if Iran takes certain actions-such as expelling iaea inspectors, beginning the enrichment of weapons-grade uranium, or installing large numbers of advanced centrifuges, any one of which would signal that it had decided to build a bomb. Kroenig is likely right that these developments-and perhaps others, such as the discovery of new covert enrichment sites-would create a decision point for the use of force. But the Iranians have not taken these steps yet, and as Kroenig acknowledges, "Washington has a very good chance" of detecting them if they do.

**AT: Iran Relations/Mid East Stability Impact**

#### Deal doesn’t solve stability or relations.

Randolph 15. [Eric, AFP reporter, “Even full deal with Iran could fail to stabilise Mideast: analysts” Yahoo News – April 3 -- http://news.yahoo.com/even-full-deal-iran-could-fail-stabilise-mideast-223412754.html]

Negotiators hope a nuclear deal will bring Iran back into the diplomatic fold, but experts are divided on whether it will douse the many fires of the Middle East. Iran and six world powers agreed Thursday on the outline of a potentially historic deal to curtail its nuclear programme in return for the lifting of economic sanctions on the Islamic republic.¶ Even while struggling under sanctions and in diplomatic isolation, Iran's influence has been on the rise and it is deeply involved across the region.¶ On top of its long-standing ties to the Syrian regime and Hezbollah militants in Lebanon, it has been leading the fight against the Islamic State group in Iraq and is the chief backer of the surging Huthi rebellion in Yemen.¶ When negotiations over Iran's nuclear programme began in 2013, there were hopes a deal could pave the way for greater cooperation on these security issues, but some analysts say the moment may have passed.¶ "Things have changed so much in the last few months, even weeks. The nuclear issue used to be the paramount issue in the region, but the security debate has moved on," said David Hartwell, managing director of Middle East Insider magazine based in London. ¶ Some still hope the agreement will encourage Iran and its Middle Eastern rivals to sit down together.¶ "Up to now Iran intervenes without being asked in regional issues and that leads to war. An agreement means Iran must start playing a more diplomatic game," said Bernard Hourcade, of the National Centre for Scientific Research in Paris.¶ Hasni Abidi, director of the Geneva-based Study and Research Centre for the Arab and Mediterranean World, said one possible result of sanctions being dropped is that Iran will become more interventionist using weapons bought with the funds released from unfrozen accounts.¶ "On the other hand, will the international recognition make it less aggressive, will it make Iran drop its pressure (on its regional rivals)?," Abidi said.¶ UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon said Thursday the nuclear deal "will contribute to peace and stability in the region".¶ But the last week has seen Iran's chief rival Saudi Arabia set up a 10-country Arab military coalition to check the Iran-backed Huthis in Yemen, launching air strikes across the country.¶ Many fear the region is on the verge of full-blown war rather than reconciliation, with the leading powers unlikely to cooperate even on areas of common interest.¶ "There is precious little evidence that the Saudis or anyone else is happy with Iran's involvement in the fight against (the Islamic State group), or willing to cooperate with Iran on anything at all," said Hartwell.